12-31-01

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Purchased by the

Mrs. Robert Lenox Kennedy Church History Fund

BR 145 .G99
Gwatkin, Henry Melvill, 18
-1916,
The church, past and prese

THE CHURCH

PAST AND PRESENT

THE CHURCH

PAST AND PRESENT

A REVIEW OF ITS HISTORY

BY

THE BISHOP OF LONDON, BISHOP BARRY,
AND OTHER WRITERS

EDITED BY THE

REV. H. M. GWATKIN, M.A.

DIXIE PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY
OF CAMBRIDGE; D.D. OF EDINBURGH

NEW YORK
THOMAS WHITTAKER
2 & 3 BIBLE HOUSE

PREFACE

We write not as advocates of this or that party in Church or State, but as students who are persuaded that history as well as science is the message of the Spirit to our own time. Our bond of union is the conviction that our Saviour's Person is itself the revelation, of which Scripture and the Church are only the record and the witness; but that His Holy Spirit is the Teacher of all ages, revealing more and more of Christ as men can bear it—to nations in history, to individuals in life. We believe that Spirit speaks in the creative thought and work of every age—in Origen and Athanasius, in Augustine and Gregory VII., in the reformers and the authors of our own Liturgy and Articles, and in the great discoveries of history and science in our own time. We are the heirs of all the ages, and we claim all truth as ours in Him who is the Truth. Though the historical facts which constitute the Gospel are recorded once for all, we believe that the unfolding of their meaning is a work of many ages, that its fulness far transcends the systems of Latin sectarianism, and that every return to the limitations of a buried past is so much sin against the Holy Spirit's teaching to our own time.

The above paragraph was the basis of the present volume, and states its general purpose.

Be it clearly understood that each contributor is responsible for his own work, and for nothing more. The writers approach their subjects from very different standpoints, and sometimes differ considerably in opinions; and no attempt has been made to conceal differences; for they do but emphasize their general agreement.

It was no part of the original plan that the Editor should write as many as four chapters out of thirteen. Only the failure of a valued contributor at the last moment obliged him to undertake four chapters instead of two, and to write the last of the four without access to his own reference books. He would have much preferred to leave it in Professor Allen's abler hands.

COLWICH VICARAGE,
Sept. 9, 1899.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

PAGE

THE APOSTOLIC AGE 1

By the Rev. J. LLEWELYN DAVIES, M.A.,
Vicar of Kirkby Lonsdale.

CHAPTER II

THE SECOND CENTURY 17

By the EDITOR.

CHAPTER III

THE SCHOOL OF ALEXANDRIA 33

By the Rev. C. BIGG, D.D.,
Rector of Fenny Compton.

CHAPTER IV

THE AGE OF COUNCILS 56

By the Rev. G. A. SCHNEIDER, M.A.,
Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Sodor and Man.

CHAPTER V

THE LATIN CHURCH 87

By the EDITOR.

CHAPTER VI

ENGLAND BEFORE THE REFORMATION . . . 104

By the Rev. W. E. COLLINS, M.A.,
Professor of Ecclesiastical History, King's College, London.

CHAPTER VII

PAGE

THE REFORMATION 125

By the Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF LONDON.

CHAPTER VIII

THE RISE OF DISSENT IN ENGLAND 135

By the Rev. J. HUNT, D.D.,
Vicar of Otford.

CHAPTER IX

THE ORIGINS OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT . . . 163

By the EDITOR.

CHAPTER X

HISTORY OF THE LORD'S SUPPER 179

By the Rev. Canon MEYRICK, M.A.,
Rector of Blickling.

CHAPTER XI

PROTESTANTISM 199

By the EDITOR.

CHAPTER XII

ROMANISM SINCE THE REFORMATION 221

By the Rev. Chancellor LIAS, M.A.,
Rector of East Bergholt.

CHAPTER XIII

ENGLISH CHRISTIANITY TO-DAY 265

By the Right Rev. ALFRED BARRY, D.D.

THE CHURCH

PAST AND PRESENT

CHAPTER I

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

By the Rev. J. LLEWELYN DAVIES, M.A.

The records of the life and teaching of our Lord and of the founding of the Christian Society cannot but have a unique authority to all who claim to belong to that society; and it is not wonderful that it should often have been assumed that the constitution and customs of the Church in any age ought to imitate as closely as possible what is shown us in the New Testament. But our sacred volume itself contradicts such an assumption; for, the more thoroughly and intelligently it is examined, the more clearly is it seen to describe, not a fixed arrangement such as might be copied and reproduced, but a growing organism. This character of the Church of Christ, that it began as a germ and grew with the years, is a part of its glory, and declares it the more manifestly to be a product of the creative power of the Eternal. We contemplate in the New Testament the powers of the new age exhibiting themselves and doing their earliest work; and the faithfulness of each Christian communion is proved in its letting those forces work freely and with effect upon the historical conditions of the time.

The Church of Christ had its birth on the Day of Pentecost. But preparation had been previously made for the great event of that day. The Apostles, "Peter with the Eleven," who stood forth as the founders of the Church, had been instructed and commissioned for their work. They were envoys of the Lord Jesus, agents whom He chose and sent forth. Their task was to bear witness of Him; to proclaim Him as the Messiah who after being rejected and crucified had risen from the dead, and to invite men to believe in Him. Promises had been given them which were fulfilled on the Day of Pentecost: their eyes were to be opened by an Ephphatha from above, emotions and thoughts were to be breathed into them by a Divine Spirit, and they were to find themselves in a Home with Christ and the Father and their brethren; they were to be clothed with power from on high. And that was what they experienced. They spoke, those few Galileans, in their new strength, with confidence and dignity and fervour, and the Spirit spread from them to their hearers. Men were touched and moved, and drawn to the Crucified and to the Father, and this common attraction bound them together in a rudimentary association. So the Church began its life of the ages.

Even the forming of the society was a natural result, rather than an express project. All turned upon the action of the Apostles; and they, we must assume, were possessed and absorbed by the vision of their Heavenly Lord as present with them, and by that power of the Spirit which had first lifted them from their feet and carried them away, and then had settled into a strong joy and hope within them. What could

believers in the Crucified do but keep together? There were, indeed, two injunctions of their Master which the Apostles remembered and followed. Those who should be brought to believe in Jesus and the Father were to be cleansed from their sins by a washing of forgiveness. So this baptism was from the first the mark put upon those who desired to join themselves to the Apostles. The other ordinance was the joint feeding upon the Body and Blood of Christ. When we look at the narratives of the Last Supper, we see no inclusion of others besides the Twelve in the privilege then conferred, nor is there any word of Christ recorded in the Gospels which made this ordinance a universal one. The character of suspense which belongs to the period between the Resurrection and the Pentecost would incline us to the belief that the Apostles did not begin the observance of the Lord's Supper for themselves in those days. But when the outpouring of the Holy Spirit brought the Apostles and the other believers together in joy and brotherhood, we can hardly imagine that the Twelve could have helped associating their brethren with themselves in the act which drew them closest to the invisible Christ. We seem to see what could not have been otherwise in the Church life of the very first days; "they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers." The Church, then, at its beginning was a fellowship of men and women who gathered round the Twelve, believing in the Crucified Jesus as the Son of God and as present with them, animated by a spirit of enthusiastic thankfulness and joy, all having been baptized and observing for their one distinctive custom the joint partaking of the bread

and the wine which represent the Body and Blood of their Lord, and looking forward with a yearning hope to a triumph of His royal authority.

What is most necessary for the understanding of the history of the Church in the Apostolic age, is to bring to bear upon it the belief of its members in the active Lordship of Christ, and their consciousness of the continued influence of the Spirit. If these powers had been nothing but delusions, they were delusions which had the full force of living realities to the founders of the Church, and with that authority impelled and guided their action. After the Pentecost the Society went on, conscious of a marvellous salvation, referring its call and its spiritual life to the one Lord and the one Spirit, assuming its duty to be to carry out the purposes of the Redeemer of mankind, which were those of the One Eternal Father. The Church organised itself, not on any prescribed plan, but just as organisation was called for by its nature and its task, combined with the circumstances of its history.

It was led on step by step. Our attention is drawn by the sacred history much more to the propaganda committed to the envoys of Christ, and to the working of the Spirit in the lives of the believers, than to details of the Church's internal constitution. The first creation of an office was a typical instance of the manner in which Church order was developed. The Seven were appointed to meet a need which called for some action, and to guard the concord and mutual trust which it was the glory of the Spirit to produce. The Twelve were still exercising their original authority, but they asked the brethren to make choice of seven good men, and to these they committed, with prayer

and the laying-on of hands, the charge of distributing aid to the poor. The Twelve and the Seven now held office in the Church at Jerusalem. A more serious movement of expansion came on by degrees and slowly. The Church was a Jewish body, believing in a Messiah, and its original home was in Jerusalem. But its Gospel soon showed that it could not be confined within the Jewish enclosure. The receiving of Gentile proselytes into the fold of the Abrahamic covenant had long been a familiar thing to the Jews, and the Apostles had been prepared by some intimations from their Master for the universal dominion of the Son of Man. The leader of the Twelve had the privilege of baptizing the first Gentile as a brother of those who believed in Jesus as the Messiah ; and he was induced to do this by various indications which he understood to be signs of the will of God, conspiring as they did with the pious hope which was waiting to be stirred into energy. But a new envoy of Christ was chosen and commissioned for the bold action which was to claim all Gentile races for the Kingdom of the crucified Messiah, and to turn the Jerusalem brotherhood into a world-wide Church.

The place of St. Paul in the history of the Church has much to astonish us, and nothing could illustrate more strikingly than his career the free working of the powers of the new Dispensation.

We see the Church called into existence by the Twelve, and taught and governed for a time by them as a society entirely depending upon themselves. The dependence is qualified by the direct rule of Christ and the moving power of the Spirit, but not by any other human authority. Then they begin to fade as a

governing body out of the history of the Church. No explanation is given us of this disappearance. Yet not only were they the *de facto* supreme and sole authority in the Church, but the Gospels show us what a distinct and solemn commission they received from their Master, and with what comprehensive forethought they were prepared for the unique task to which they were appointed. We see them the envoys of the risen Jesus, sent forth by Him as He had been sent forth by His Father, charged to proclaim their Lord as King and to draw men to belief in Him, enabled by their intimacy with Him to convey to other men trustworthy knowledge concerning Him, endowed with a heavenly Spirit, having the promise that they should sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. All this was fully recognised by the early Church, and is set forth in its records. It does not appear that there was any dissension caused by differences of judgment amongst them. Precedence was yielded to Peter and James and John, and of these to Peter. We read of their acting with joint authority as the governing body of the Church when they send Peter and John to Samaria, to receive into the fellowship of the Spirit the converts made by Philip. They are mentioned again when Barnabas, acting as surety for Saul, "brought him to the Apostles" at Jerusalem. After that time the Twelve appeared to lose by degrees their coherence as a governing body, and the Church at Jerusalem, whilst it remains the Mother Church, obtains an organisation of its own. The report of the success of the Gospel at Antioch "came to the ears of the Church which was at Jerusalem, and they sent forth Barnabas as far as Antioch." When the disciples at Antioch were moved

to send relief to the brethren which dwelt in Judæa, they sent it "to the elders." When James the brother of John was put to death, we do not read that his place was filled; the Twelve must have come by this time to the momentous conviction that they were appointed for a special work, and that they were not to co-opt successors as a permanent governing body. Another James appears on the scene. Peter, after his deliverance from prison, coming first to the house of Mary the mother of John, declares to those who were assembled there "how the Lord had brought him forth out of the prison," and then bids them "tell these things unto James and to the brethren," and goes away to another place. The brethren at Antioch, when they were troubled by the question whether Gentile converts should be circumcised or not, appointed that Paul and Barnabas and others "should go up to Jerusalem unto the Apostles and elders about this question." The phrase, "the Apostles and elders," is repeated. The Antioch envoys were received by "the Church and the Apostles and the elders." "The Apostles and the elders were gathered together to consider of this matter." There was much questioning, and then Peter rose up, reminding his audience that he had been chosen to receive the first Gentile into the Church. It is James who pronounces the final judgment of the Assembly. And the action taken is thus described: "It seemed good to the Apostles and the elders, with the whole Church," to send two of their chief men with an official letter to Antioch; and the letter begins, "The Apostles and the elder brethren unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia, greeting." Some time after, when St. Paul went up on his last visit

to Jerusalem, we read, "The brethren received us gladly. And the day following Paul went in with us unto James, and all the elders were present." It seems a reasonable inference from these passages that, when the Church began to spread beyond Jerusalem, the Twelve withdrew from the actual government of the Jerusalem society, and did not retain any official unity as the governing body of the whole Church. What deference was paid to them was paid to their personal authority, and they occupied themselves as each was moved and led in bearing their witness and proclaiming their Gospel.

The question is a little complicated by the habit which arose of giving the name Apostles to others besides the Twelve. If, when Andronicus and Junias are said by St. Paul to be "of note among the Apostles," it is meant that they were leading and conspicuous Apostles, a wide extension seems to be given to the term. We should hardly expect persons of whom we know nothing but their names to be Apostles at all, in that age of the "Acts"; but that they should be Apostles of note, sets us wondering how many Apostles there may have been who were not of note. Critics are putting us on our guard against assuming titles like ἐπίσκοπος and ἀπόστολος and διάκονος and even πρεσβύτερος to be always official names; but St. Paul more than once appears to give a definite first place to "Apostles" amongst the ministries of the Church. The view that the designation was limited to those who had seen the Lord Jesus after His resurrection has much to commend it, but it is hardly in harmony with the significance of the word "envoy," or with the sub-apostolic use of the title. Perhaps "Apostles" are

named first as being those who began the work of building up the Church in any new place by making a first appearance there as heralds of the Christ. Or the title may have been given to those who were known to have been sent on special missions by leading Churches, as Barnabas and Saul were by the Church at Antioch.

Whilst the Twelve were decreasing, another was increasing. Saul of Tarsus showed no eagerness to head a party in the Church. He took time for convictions to mature and develop themselves in his great soul. He was content for a while to act as coadjutor to the genial and fervid Barnabas. He did not make himself dictator of the society at Antioch which owed so much to his labours. Remarkable as his call had been, and as he thoroughly well knew it to have been, he waited for guidance as to what he should do and where he should go. It is quite open to us to believe that it was not without suggestions from Barnabas and Saul themselves that these two zealous preachers were sent forth by the Church at Antioch on that mission which was bold and adventurous from the first, and which proved so supremely important in the history of the Church. But it is made clear that the Twelve had nothing to do with it. What St. Paul did afterwards on his own authority justified him in leaving out of account the fact that he had accepted a definite commission from men, in the fulfilling of which he was made the actual Apostle of the Gentiles. But the journey of the two missionaries ended with their duly making their report at Antioch, "from whence they had been committed to the grace of God for the work which they had fulfilled." These words suggest a question whether the opening of the Church to Gentiles had been dis-

cussed by the chief persons of the Church at Antioch before their envoys started. It is not easy to explain why more is not made of the conversion of so important a Gentile as Sergius Paulus the proconsul, but perhaps we are not to conclude that he was baptized and became a professed Christian. The word, "Lo, we turn to the Gentiles," was not spoken at Paphos. It was in a curiously obscure region that the gospel was first preached freely to Gentiles, and churches formed of Gentile as well as Jewish believers. The proclamation of Jesus the Crucified, in being thus extended, was also itself exalted. Jesus believed in by Jews as their Messiah, even with a promise of His future dominion over the world, was hardly the same object of faith as Jesus the Son of God inviting all men to come to the Father and be forgiven. It was this Son of God of whom Paul was henceforth the herald. The relations of his expanding work to the Jewish Christian societies in Judæa and Syria became a question of great interest and importance. As we have seen, there was no chief Apostle, no governing body, presiding over the church as a whole. But St. Paul was as loyal as the most devoted of the companions of Jesus to the invisible Head of the Church ; and the one Spirit moving in all the societies and all the members was as real and divine to him as it had been to the 3000 of the Day of Pentecost. These powers—the rule of Christ, the influence of the Spirit—continue to carry the Church forward, and they preserve its unity in the most difficult circumstances. Over the churches which owed their existence to him St. Paul exercised what we must call an autocratic authority. His personal rule kept these churches together. Paul was the one Apostle, the one teacher, to

whom they looked up. But he never allowed them to forget that he was the slave of the Jesus who had shown Himself in Galilee and been put to death in Jerusalem, of the Messiah whom the Jews had been taught by their prophets to expect. And whilst he owned no subjection to any other Apostles, claiming firmly to have an independent commission from Christ, his loyalty to Christ made him set the highest value on the spiritual fellowship of all Christ's flock, and urged him to do his utmost to preserve that fellowship unbroken. What we see as regards the Church in general, in the latter years of the Apostolic age, is—Paul by far the most commanding figure in the Church, those who remained of the Twelve working here and there and regarded with great personal respect, the Churches of St. Paul acknowledging his authority, those of Judæa and Syria held together by their traditions and by deference to the Church of Jerusalem, and unity preserved between the Pauline and the Judæan Churches by the profound reverence of all for their one Heavenly Lord and by their consciousness of the active influence of the one Spirit.

Each society had some internal organisation, and no doubt the example set by the earliest societies was followed by the others. "The elders" in the Church of Jerusalem are mentioned frequently, and there were elders in every Church. The precedents afforded by the Jewish communities in Judæa and throughout the Dispersion, and by the confraternities of various kinds which then abounded in the Roman Empire, were hardly needed to suggest what was so rudimentary and natural a constitution. It is a matter of course for an association to have a committee [1] under some

[1] The word committee appears to be derived, through the French *comité*, from *comitatus*.

name or other, and a committee will, in general, have a chairman. The elders of a church were a representative committee, consisting of persons, for the most part elderly men, in whom their brethren had confidence ; and in some cases the leading elder would have an acknowledged precedence. In later years the presiding elder was specially designated by the title ἐπίσκοπος, and became the bishop of the local church. But in the New Testament, it would seem, ἐπίσκοπος should rather be rendered overseer than bishop, being used to describe the functions of an elder. In addition to the elders, there might be in any Church another class of persons, resembling the Seven who were appointed by the Twelve at Jerusalem, and called ministers or servers. The word διάκονος had hardly then obtained a strictly official sense, but was used in accordance with its ordinary meaning. A Christian Society, whether in Judæa or founded by St. Paul, consisted of "the brethren" ; and these had their elders, with or without a recognised chief elder, and their deacons.

There were two features of the Apostolic age, which, while they existed and when they passed away, must be considered as having had an important influence upon the organisation of the Church. One was, the personal authority of the Twelve and St. Paul ; the other, the worship offered in the Temple at Jerusalem. The departure of the Apostles made room for the development of the order of bishops ; and it may be supposed that the sacrificial ideas and sentiments which had been associated with the Temple-worship sought some satisfaction, when the Temple was destroyed and its worship abolished, in the regular ministry and worship of the Church.

We contemplate with astonishment the work done by the Apostle of the Gentiles during the few years of his Apostolic service between Antioch and Rome. It is evident that there was a wonderful persistent enthusiasm by which he was himself impelled, and which he was able in some degree to communicate to strangers who heard him. We can understand the impression that might be made by the proclamation of the Cross and the offer of forgiveness and reconciliation. But the Apostle's testimony produced in the minds of the believers not only a response to Divine grace, but also a conviction that there was something before them, something to live for, a movement to which they were surrendering themselves. The Christians of the Apostolic age were looking forward to a Coming, an Appearing, a Day, of the Lord. What this exactly signified to St. Paul and the Apostolic teachers in general it is not easy to determine. There are some passages in the New Testament which suggest that they expected an "end of the world" as it would be popularly understood now. But other passages convey a different impression, and would lead us to believe that St. Paul was rather looking for a fuller diffusion of light which had already shone, for the prevailing over the world of a kingdom which had been already established, for a gradual accomplishment of Divine purposes of which the working was already manifested.

The reader of the Epistle to the Ephesians, for example, would conclude that the writer had his mind set upon a gradual consummation of what had been gloriously begun. The believers were contemplated and addressed as having been raised from the dead and exalted with Christ ; the future was to be in accordance

with the power already working in them ; God was to show in the ages coming on the exceeding riches of His grace in kindness towards men in Christ Jesus ; the body of Christ was to be built up through the action of the ministries provided for that purpose. The Day of the Lord was regarded as the coming of light ; and the believers at Thessalonica and at Rome were bidden to understand that for them the light had already come, that they were sons of light, sons of the day, and that they were bound to walk as in the light. In the perplexing address of St. Peter given in Acts iii., he calls upon his countrymen to repent, so that God may send them the Christ who had been appointed for them. The time in which he is speaking is that of which all the prophets had spoken, the time of the restoration or resettlement of all things, introduced by a second Elijah. Indeed, the risen Christ was already sent, if only the people by repenting would open their eyes to see Him. "To you first God, having raised up His Servant, sent Him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from your iniquities." The consummation was to be brought about through the turning to God of Israel and of all the families of the earth. On the whole, the Christians were taught that there was Divine glory to be revealed, that they were enlisted into an army of light for which victory and triumph were prepared, and that they and all men were to be blessed in knowing Christ and the Father. Appeal was constantly made to the Spirit working in the societies and in each believer ; this Spirit was an earnest of the future inheritance, a sign and guide as to the Divine purpose. So that the consciousness of the believers was not that, when they had been saved out of estrange-

ment and darkness, things had been settled for them, and that each had only to look forward to being removed by death into a condition of perfect felicity, but rather that they were called to have a part in an approaching triumph, and that they had to follow such a leader as Paul in a campaign against the evil powers which was to end in a conquest of the world for Christ. And we can understand this to have been an inspiriting consciousness.[1]

As we look back from our existing environment upon the Church of St. Paul and his fellow-believers, the differences between our condition and theirs multiply upon the imagination till it becomes a little difficult to pronounce distinctly what we have as Christians in common with them. We have at least a negative point of agreement, upon which I have thought it important to dwell. There is now no earthly head or governing body of the universal Church. It is sometimes depressing to many of us to reflect that Christendom is made up of a number of bodies independent of each other, and that there is no authority over all to tell them what they are to believe and how they are to act, so that they may believe and act in unison. But there was similar independence, a similar absence of a constitutional governing body over the Church, in the Apostolic age. In

[1] There are symptoms of impatience and disappointment following the excited expectations of the early Christian years. But on the other hand there can have been no general collapse of the Church at the close of the Apostolic age, when the Christians saw that the age was closing without that visible return of the Lord in celestial glory which many had expected. And it is remarkable that the prophecies of the Lord's coming which had been preserved in the Apostolic memoirs and letters were studied and edited in the second century without any apparent uneasy feeling that the prophecies had been fallacious. The Church lived and grew through a period of what might be represented as overwhelming disillusionment.

that age the Christians were taught to believe that Christ and His Spirit were governing the Church, and that those who sought guidance from Christ and the Spirit might rely on the promise, "I will not leave you bereaved, helpless," and would receive the guidance they needed. If it was, and is, the will of the Divine Saviour that His people should always look to Him and the Spirit, would not that explain why the Church is without a visible governing authority? Divided as Christians are now, we have great unities to which we all profess allegiance in common with the Apostolic Christians. "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as also we were called in one hope of our calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all." If we would accept the monition of the Apostolic age, the way to the vital and perfect unity of the body of Christ, the hope of justifying more obviously the name of the Catholic Church, is not through agreeing to submit to one governing authority, still less through bringing all Christian societies into one pattern of outward organisation, but through adhering more closely to the one Heavenly Head, submitting more simply to the impulses of the one Spirit, and cherishing with more fervour the common ambitions of the Divine kingdom.

CHAPTER II

THE SECOND CENTURY

By the EDITOR

The revelation to which the Church of God bears witness is neither a body of dogmas, nor a code of laws, nor a system of philosophy, but a living Person. Christ our Saviour, Son of God and Son of Man, is Himself the revelation, at once of God to man and of God in man. The gospel of His thirty years or so of sojourn here on earth is only the light from heaven by which His mighty working in heaven and earth is thrown on the majestic background of eternity. Christ came to destroy nothing at all, save the works of the devil, but to fulfil the fair promise of God's world, which man had marred by sin. He came that we might have life, and have it in abundance; not to stunt or mutilate even the bodily nature, but to quicken the dormant spirit and hallow every deed and word and thought of man with life divine.

Hence the elasticity and vast variety of Christianity. Dogma is satisfied with assent, law with obedience, philosophy with understanding; but a living Person calls for nothing short of the whole man's personal devotion. Given only that personal devotion, the Lord receives men as He finds them, with all their weaknesses and errors, and all their limitations of race and time and individual character. Through all these His Spirit

works, guiding them into truth as they are able to receive it. Thus, though Christianity—the love of Christ—is always in itself the same, its outward and historic form is shaped by outward and historic causes. Just because the living power is from heaven, heavenly, its working in the world is natural, not magical. At once transcendent and immanent, it works in and through natural laws, yet lifts up nature to a higher level. The lifting process may seem slow and partial, though we can trace out something of its course in history; but if ages of ages were needed to prepare the world for the coming of the eternal Word, ages may be needed again for the working of the power that is to lift up man above the angels.

Christian duty is the love of Christ and nothing more: but love must work on knowledge and show itself in action. The knowledge is of the Lord's person, for there is no Christian doctrine but this—the rest are inferences of reason from it. The action ranges through the whole of life, for no part of life in Christ is common or unclean. Religions may be content with a ritual, but the revelation calls for the whole man. If there be right action, or true fact, or living force apart from Christ, then Christ is neither the way, nor the truth, nor the life.

Now the natural man—and we all have a good deal of the natural man—cannot give this personal devotion. His religion is a religion of fear, as the Cambridge Platonists used to say; and he cannot get rid of his fear by simply calling himself a Christian. He fears Christ, and searches heaven and earth for mediators—angels and saints in heaven, saints and priests on earth, who seem nearer to him and less terrible than the

gracious Saviour. He fears Christ, and seeks by all means to escape the searching sternness of the Saviour's claim—the claim of perfect love—on every act and word and thought. Sometimes he ignores its practical side, and contents himself with right belief or right feeling which leaves his life untouched. More commonly he tones it down till he thinks he can meet it, requiring perhaps what he fancies a higher standard from saints or clerics. He may limit its range like the Pharisees, and take refuge in ceremonialism and formality; or he may turn ascetic, and fight the body instead of the carnal nature. Above all, he walks by sight and not by faith, and craves a carnal certainty which the Lord never promised. He may make gods to go before him, and worship any sort of idols; or he may make for himself masters upon earth—popes, councils, churches, priests, or spiritual directors, who shall precisely tell him what he must believe and do.

These are permanent tendencies of human nature, abundantly illustrated in the history of religions. Mahometanism, Buddhism, and other systems, have run courses very like that of Christianity. The tendencies are much the same in all, though in each case one or another of them may find a check. Thus Mahometanism has developed saints and ascetics in abundance, and an uncreated Koran, but neither priests nor idols. Judaism had its priestly ritual and traditions of the elders, but was quite free from idols. Greek and Roman heathenism had gods many and lords many, each with his peculiar worship; but their authoritative traditionalism was more political than religious. The tendencies of the natural man are clearly seen in the common features of the development of religions, and

we may expect to meet them again in the history of the revelation.

We shall not be disappointed. The race is like the man. Age after age starts with fresh enthusiasm, rejoicing as a giant to run his course ; and age after age sinks paralysed with sin, its work but half begun, its ideals defiled and cast aside. History is a record of failures, of ruined empires and forgotten peoples, vanished civilisations and fallen Churches, for even the power of God seems drawn into the vortex of universal failure. Yet history is the most inspiriting of all studies. Through shames and failures the uplifting hand is working hitherto. The shames remain for warning, the failures do but lay foundations deeper, and the work that is done in Christ abideth. To each generation is given some new view of truth ; and that remains. The veil is lifting slowly ; but in these latter days we begin to see how the long procession of the ages is gathering round the glorious figure of the Son of Man who is the Lord of all.

We begin, then, with the Apostolic age, when the steps of Christ were fresh, and echoes of His gracious words remained with hundreds who had followed Him. It was an age of great things. Churches overspread the empire in one generation, from Gaul to Pontus ; and they not only witnessed the new life that had come into the world, but showed its working. In them the love of Christ had overcome the deepest prejudices of the ancient world—Jew and Gentile, slave and barbarian, were brethren alike—and solved the social problems which baffled Rome, and baffle Europe still. They had abolished beggary, lifted woman to her rightful place, and even drawn the sting of slavery.

No marvel if all generations have called them blessed. Yet even the Apostolic age was no golden time of purity. Mightily as the spirit of Christ was working, the spirit of Antichrist was working too. There was lying at Jerusalem, strife at Antioch, apostasy in Galatia, fornication at Corinth, "philosophy" at Colossæ. The scandals were great, the divisions quite as deep as those of later times.

The Apostolic age is separated from the sub-Apostolic by a storm that shook the world. First the fires of Nero's persecution shone out in lurid horror like the dawning of the day of doom. Then came the last great strife of Rome and Israel for the dominion of the East. Then the Empire was itself convulsed with the great civil wars which revealed its fatal weakness of dependence on the legions. And when the storm had spent its fury, the scene was changed. Rome, indeed, seemed as glorious as ever; yet something had passed away with the house of Divus Julius. With the measured strength of middle life—still ample, but not without a conscious limit—she entered on a silver age of prosaic peace, unstirred by civil war, before the death of Commodus. But the Temple was in ruins, Jerusalem a desolation, Israel uprooted from its place among the nations. The Christian Church was uprooted too. The Churches were cut loose in one direction from apostolic guidance, in another from their Jewish origins, in yet another from Roman toleration. Some strands of connection with the past remained, like St. John at Ephesus, but, upon the whole, the Churches became more and more Greek Churches, guided by successors of Apostles, while Rome had now declared herself a standing enemy. In equal contrast

to the particularism of ancient times, the Empire and the Church were universal forces, and between them lay the future of the world. Hence three centuries of bitter enmity, followed by a thousand years of firm alliance.

There is the sharpest possible contrast between the bursting fulness of apostolic writings and the intellectual poverty of the next generation. Its greatness was not on that side. Perhaps even Polycarp understood the deeper teachings of St. John no better than Clement understood St. Paul. Yet the sub-Apostolic fathers are striking characters. There is Clement, the lover of concord, setting forth the order of God's world as a plea for order in God's Church at Corinth ; and the martyr Ignatius, whose rugged sentences are sparkles of intense conviction ; and the saintly Polycarp, who "stood like an anvil," and could speak with all the sternness of St. John himself. But all three are alike in a deep and thankful piety unsurpassed in later ages. There is a loveliness of its own in this afterglow of Apostolic times.

The problem before them was one that called for all their piety, and more than all their wisdom. The Churches had suddenly lost their ready appeal on doctrine to the witness of Apostles, and could no longer call in the authority of Apostles to put down corporate disorder ; and the organisation which remained when Apostles were withdrawn was very weak. They needed stronger local government and stronger bonds of union with each other, if they were to face the dangers of the new age. The outward danger from persecution was not small, for persecution falls first on leaders, and cuts off the very men whose wisdom is most needed. True, it calls out heroic examples, and greatly helps to weed

out the time-servers and the unstable brethren ; but it seldom softens those whom it fails to overcome. Its hardening influence is conspicuous in the later persecutions which we know best, and the sudden arrests and executions must have done a good deal to confuse order and relax discipline. But the internal dangers were the greatest. Our scanty information gives us no reason to suppose that the strifes and rivalries of the Apostolic age were followed by unruffled calm. The quarrels might be merely personal, as they seem to have been at Corinth when Clement wrote ; but they were often also doctrinal. The disorders of Galatians, Colossians, or Corinthians sprang from permanent tendencies of human nature, and have therefore been reproduced in all ages. Galatians were now represented by Judaizers generally, and Colossians by Gnostics, while the partisanship and immorality of Corinth is always a practical danger. Christian duty was fairly clear, however it might be neglected ; and indeed it differed from the better popular ideas of duty more in motives and sanctions, and therefore in intensity, than in substance and contents. But the Christian doctrine, which is the ground of Christian motive, was less easily kept in view, so that it was necessary to put its essential parts into simple forms for common use, and to provide for it more lasting guardians than the original witnesses. Furthermore, the Churches were compelled by the attacks of heathens and heretics not merely to define their positions, but to defend them, to show their historic soundness and consistency with reason, and to refute current objections. If they began with simple apologies like those of Aristides and Justin, they were gradually drawn on to the historical criticism of Irenæus,

to the philosophy of Clement, and to the fuller doctrinal schemes of Origen and Cyprian.

Thus there were three great needs. Church government needed strengthening, to check disorders like those of Corinth and to secure continuity of teaching. That teaching needed to be placed on a basis of Scripture, now that even the disciples of the old witnesses were passing away ; and it needed also to be summed up in simple forms, so that neither friends nor enemies could mistake its main contents. The revelation moreover needed to be set forth in its relation to the thought of that age and of past ages, not merely answering Jewish or heathen objection, but showing its bearing on current forms of religion and philosophy, and showing also the abiding power of the risen Son of Man to satisfy the deepest needs of human nature in its widest range.

In each of these three directions the Apostles had laid foundations. If they had no wish to solve prematurely the problems of the next generation, they left hints on which it could work. The first problem, as we saw, was that of Church government, and a few words will suffice on this, for its growth will be more fully traced in another chapter. There is no trace of (monarchical) bishops in the New Testament, whereas by the end of the second century every city has its one bishop, who for his lifetime is head of the presbyters and official guardian of orthodoxy in that city. It is needless as well as unhistorical to suppose that the Apostles ordained episcopacy as the one lawful form of Church government. Yet St. John must have seen its rise in Asia, and seen it without disapproval, to say the least. There was an earlier hint in such a vicar-apostolic as Timothy. The only reason (though it is a

sufficient one) for refusing to recognise Timothy as bishop at Ephesus is that he was no more than a special commissioner. He was soon recalled, and there is no reason to suppose that he ever saw Ephesus again. But other vicars-apostolic may have been left stranded by an apostle's death, and remained at their post as bishops. It cannot have been a common case; but it was hint enough. Monarchy is the natural resource of men in times of danger. Just as the nations of Europe strengthened their kings against the anarchy which constantly threatened the later Middle Ages, so the sub-Apostolic Churches strengthened their bishops as centres of unity and guardians of orthodoxy. Episcopacy was so visibly the best and strongest form of government for the second century, that hardly anything short of a definite prohibition by the Apostles could have prevented its spread.

We come now to the source and the expression of Church teaching. The Old Testament was the Bible of the Apostles, so that Christianity was never a purely traditional faith. But the formation of a New Testament was unavoidable, when they put the words they had heard from the Carpenter's lips on a level with the words which God spake from Sinai to them of old. It was complete, with just a fringe of doubt concerning certain books, long before the last of their disciples passed away, and thenceforth remained for many generations the one unquestioned source of all Christian doctrine. However interpretations might differ, its supremacy was never doubted in the early Church. It is as fixed an axiom with Athanasius as with the Church of England.

But if Scripture was acknowledged as the court of

final appeal, it did not follow that every man was free to interpret it exactly as he pleased,—to force on it, for instance, Ebionism or Gnosticism, in defiance of statements whose meaning could not fairly be called doubtful. For this reason as well as others, it was necessary to sum up in a short form the chief points, not so much of Christian doctrine as of the apostolic testimony. There was an outline ready in the Lord's baptismal Formula (Matt. xxviii. 19; I see no reason to doubt its genuineness), and several passages of the New Testament give something like summings-up, though not of the sort required. So ancient creeds are always modelled on the Formula, and for this reason make slight mention of Baptism, and none at all of the Lord's Supper, of Justification, the Atonement, and other important doctrines. But all these summaries were matters of usage. A Church might have a very short confession for the catechumen to pronounce with his own lips, and a somewhat longer creed to form the basis of his instruction; but its next neighbour might word them very differently. Every Church did that which was right in its own eyes, and to this day there has never been a Catholic creed, in the sense of one acknowledged by all churches. An Eastern Christian will tell us that the Apostles' creed and the Quicunque are not creeds of the orthodox Church, and that our Nicene creed is shamefully interpolated. Yet though the early creeds varied much in wording, in substance they differed little. Agreement in the midst of diversity summed up in the most emphatic way the historical facts which constitute the Gospel, and defined better than any law could have done the limits which none who bear the name of Christ may overpass.

There still remained the hardest task of all. Though no language of men can fully express the truth of God, it was none the less necessary to show that the revelation could bear the keenest scrutiny of thoughtful heathens—not only that it practically answered the spiritual needs of all men, but that the truth it declares is one that satisfies, and more than satisfies, the noblest aspirations of human thought. And for this the sub-Apostolic age was hardly ripe. A full century of pondering was needed before a measure could be attempted of the stupendous facts connected with our Saviour's coming. Love might recognise at once the true light; but reason wanted time to gaze, and to realise its bewildering grandeur. Small wonder if men stumbled in that dazzling light, and formed strange theories of Him whom Ebionites at one end and Gnostics at the other perforce acknowledged as the centre of the world's history. Nor were the sub-Apostolic fathers men who could rule the intellectual anarchy which the coming of the Son of Man had thrown into the ancient world. Their task was to preach and iterate the Apostolic story, not to mix it up with philosophy. No man was ever less fit than Polycarp to understand the strange thoughts of a younger generation. Their firm conservatism was absolutely needed for their time: and, after all, the second century did its fair share of the work of ages in organising Churches, settling the canon, and framing creeds. The way forward was pointed out by the Biblical studies of Tatian and Melito, by the commentaries of Papias and Heracleon, by the Apologies of Aristides and Justin, and above all by the historical criticism of Irenæus and his deep thoughts on the Incarnation and the Supper of the Lord. Even the errors of Gnostics

and Montanists were found useful warnings when the School of Alexandria came forward to essay the great problem. Origen and Athanasius are beyond our present limits; but the twentieth century will have to go back to school (not to slavery) at Alexandria. Latin doctrine came in like the Law, by reason of transgressions; and now that its work is done, we must return to that older and freer covenant of God with Greece, which no later Latin law can disannul.

The second century has points of likeness to many later ages. In one direction it recalls the iron conservatism of the changeless East; in another the firm discipline of Rome or Geneva; in another the Scripturalism of Protestant Churches; in another the excitement of the old Methodists or the new Salvation Army. In yet another it reflects the anarchy of thought in our time, for most of the disputed questions were astonishingly modern; and the final question behind them—Christ or Agnosticism?—is the final question of all ages.

Yet it differed greatly from them all. Lines of thought were less defined, and language was less fixed than in later times. Words were still fluid which afterwards became technical terms, and many technical terms were not yet invented. Whole regions of doctrine were so far unexplored, and the best studied parts of it were not yet worked out with the many-sided care of many ages. There was no possibility yet of anything like our modern Confessions, where every phrase recalls the controversies of the past, and every sentence is shaped by the struggles of centuries. With this state of things there naturally went many crudities of doctrine. Some of them have seldom been revived in later times,

like the materialising views of both sacraments connected with the materialising idea of the soul derived from the Stoics. Even if the material water of baptism or the material bread of the Lord's Supper be supposed to have a quasi-material influence, nobody would now explain it by their affinity to a material soul. But most of the crudities are the recurring ideas of all ages. The Millennarians, for instance, are always with us, and the computers of the number of the Beast and of the end of the world, and the believers in the material fires of hell, for the literalists are men of all times. The Quakers are not the first who scrupled oaths and war ; and there is no novelty in the vegetarians, or in the temperance men who refuse the eucharistic wine. There were thought-readers, too, and spiritualists and mediums—no mean practitioners—and conjurers and impostors in rich variety, ranging down from hypnotists as devilish as some of our own to the common quacks of the market. Hardly a folly of our time was wanting—Anglo-Israel of course excepted. Graver thoughts were also very like our own. The difficulties of Theism and Agnosticism were most of them familiar to the Gnostics ; and things like Mariolatry and transubstantiation were not unknown among them, for it would not be easy to find a heresy the Gnostics never thought of. So modern is it all, in many ways more modern than a world our fathers could well remember.

How then shall we class the Church of the second century with regard to modern Churches ? Protestant it was not, for Protestantism never succeeded very well in its persistent endeavour to return to primitive models. It is no harder to raise the dead than to restore a vanished past. For good and for evil, the simplicity of

early times was gone for ever long before the Reformation. The long centuries of Latin tutelage had left an indelible mark on Western thought ; and Protestantism —at least Lutheran and English Protestantism—was far too reverent and wise to undo with one fell blow the work of ages. It was too Christian and too Northern to accept without reserve, too Christian and too Latin to set aside without discrimination, the great structure of Latin thought which faced it at the Reformation. Thus the part rejected was rejected with an emphasis unknown to earlier times, and the part retained had much in it of purely Latin and not of primitive growth. Protestantism might speak in deliberate opposition to Rome, or in deliberate agreement with Rome ; and either way was a clear departure from primitive models. The one thing it could not possibly do was to speak in primitive unconsciousness of Rome's existence. Thus though we find in the second century plenty of the Protestant doctrine which the Latin Church rejects, it is hardly ever laid down with the distinctive emphasis of Protestantism. In this sense, and chiefly in this sense, the second century is not Protestant.

On the other hand, we find very few traces of the Latin doctrine which Protestantism, at least Lutheran and English Protestantism, rejected ; and those we do find are chiefly Gnostic. There were germs of evil in prayers for the dead, in enthusiastic admiration of martyrs, and in overmuch regard for the physical facts of fasting and virginity, and perhaps in other things ; but they were hardly more than germs. Speaking broadly, the Church of the second century meets the current Latin doctrine of the Middle Ages with a negative protest of silence and of contrary teaching and

example, which to the student is even more impressive than the positive protest of the Reformation. Thus we find no traces of Papal jurisdiction, but abundant signs that every Church in Christendom would have resented any such claim as a piece of arrogance. All are agreed that the Church bears witness to the broad facts of the creed; but nobody contemplates a further Catholic tradition of ritual, discipline, or dogma, which individual Churches are not free to alter as they think fit. The infallibility of councils is unknown to this age and the next; and even in the fourth century the first faint suggestion of it by the Arians rouses the indignant scorn of Athanasius. The supremacy of Scripture is everywhere taken for granted; and if Scripture is nowhere directly and expressly opposed to tradition, neither is tradition anywhere made an independent source of doctrine. Even Tertullian maintains no more than Hooker's position, that a Church is not bound to show a direct command of Scripture for every ceremony it ordains. There is no trace of a sacrificing (not purely pastoral and eucharistic) priesthood till after Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria; and Cyprian himself strictly limits that priesthood to the bishop, and calls the presbyters no more than Levites. Sacrifice is commonly spoken of, but only sacrifice of thanksgiving, and the altar, Irenæus tells us, is in heaven. The bread of the Lord's Supper is no longer common bread; but bread it always is, though "bread with a blessing," for nobody dreams of anything like transubstantiation unless it be a few Gnostics. If Protestantism has too sharply limited the possibilities of God's mercy to the dead, it at least went wrong with Irenæus; and the hardest Calvinism never preached a

more horrible gospel of hell fire than Cyprian in the next age. Altogether, the questions are few on which there is any reason to suppose that the Church of the second century would have preferred Roman statements to those of the English Articles.

CHAPTER III

THE SCHOOL OF ALEXANDRIA

By the Rev. C. BIGG, D.D.

CHRISTIANITY was a new life cast into the midst of an old civilisation. With amazing strength and speed it flew forth beyond the narrow limits of its birthplace, the land of Judæa, circling through every region of the empire, and rising from class to class of society.

At first it was little more than a life, with many intuitions and few formularies, yet carrying within it the germs of thought which experience must necessarily develope. It went forth like a child, naïve and unconscious, yet always serenely confident that it was endued with a power capable of regenerating the whole world.

As the Church passed on its way, onwards and upwards, it came into contact with all the convictions and all the doubts of Jew and Gentile, of all sorts and conditions of men. The old state of unreasoned assurance could not endure. Sooner or later the Christian was bound to give account of himself, to himself and to others, in the light of the best knowledge of the day, and in language that could be accepted or disputed. Was the Church fit only for cobblers and fullers, as Celsus asserted, or could it take charge of intelligence? Could it really widen the horizon by raising the point of view? Could it help the statesman and the scholar?

Was Christ, in truth, the light that lighteth every man? These were the questions that demanded answers.

By the end of the second century the Church was emerging from the contest with Gnosticism, or rather, was rising above that social stratum in which Gnosticism abode. Gnosticism was essentially a bourgeois phenomenon, borrowing much from the wild and coarse imagination of Egypt or Syria, but still more from the narrowness, the recalcitrance, and the pessimism of the ill-educated and ill-used middle class. Take a serious but unenlightened man of inferior social grade, born and bred in the Greco-Roman Empire, where a score of mythologies seethed in confusion, give him a smattering of philosophy, then introduce him to Christianity as a new religion somewhat better than the rest, and he will form a Gnostic system with its evil God, its asceticism or antinomianism, and its families of Aeons, in which Christian graces, heathen gods, Oriental angels or demons play their part as in a wild kind of religious melodrama.

Gnosticism never produced an eminent man, yet it possessed extraordinary vitality among the middle class, enduring under one shape or another till late in the Middle Ages. It raised just those formidable problems which are obvious to everybody, but it answered none of them, nor did it even point the way to an answer. Its sourness and its recalcitrance are best exemplified in the phrase of Basilides: "I will say anything rather than admit that Providence is evil." Truth does not reveal herself to men who court her thus. If the reader thinks this description of Gnosticism harsh, he should read the *Pistis Sophia*, of which an English

translation is accessible, or the account of the Manichees in the *Confessions* of St. Augustine.

But in the second century the Church was coming daily into closer contact with men of the highest education. Plutarch knew something of the Bible, and Celsus knew much. The Emperor M. Aurelius disapproved of the "obstinacy" of the Christians whom he put to death; and Fronto, his tutor, is said to have written against them. Two illustrious names in the history of Neo-Platonism are those of Numenius and Ammonius Saccas. Ammonius was at one time a Christian. Numenius spoke of Plato as "an Attic Moses," and, if we may venture on an inference from the curious dislike shown towards him by the friends of Plotinus, may have been a Jew, or even a Christian.

Clearly the hour had come for an explanation between Christianity and philosophy, and the times were favourable for such an attempt. Platonism, a noble and religious form of idealism, was in the ascendant, and offered many points of contact with the Church, especially in its doctrines of spirit and of the immortality of the soul. And, as a natural consequence of this change in the temper of the schools, the old hostility to Greek thought, which is so strongly marked in the Apologists, with the single exception of Justin, was giving way. The rank and file of the Church were still as strong as ever in their dislike of the wisdom of the world, and the same feeling is still very evident in Tertullian. No Christian would have dreamed of putting philosophy above the Creed, or substituting it for the Creed. But many were beginning to ask whether a highly-trained human intelligence could not throw light on the difficulties of Scripture, on the details of moral duty, even

on the axioms of the Creed itself. God made man in His own image. Surely, then, thought can meet revelation. The one is higher, the other lower, but there must be some affinity between the two. Reason cannot predict revelation, nor judge it when it comes, but it can prepare the way for it, test at any rate its operations, and so believe in its source, as a child believes in the larger wisdom of its father.

We must confine ourselves in the present paper to the two great Alexandrine doctors, Clement and Origen. It will not be possible to enter largely on their biographies or their personal characteristics. They were very different men. Clement, we may say, was the first Christian mystic; Origen, the first Christian schoolman. Clement was much the braver and the brighter of the two. There is a large lay element in his charming temper. He loved letters, prose or verse, tragic or comic, grave or gay. He was mystic in the same sense as Fénelon, believing that the purified spirit truly sees God and becomes one with God, and his mysticism gives him extraordinary freedom, tenderness, and tolerance. He seems to rise above all forms, "touching earth," to use his own phrase, "with but one foot;" yet he is a severe disciplinarian, bidding men seek freedom through law. But his severity, though it strikes the modern reader as rather Puritanical, is in principle always kindly and moderate, like that of St. Anselm, who loved to see his guests enjoy themselves, though he himself took none but the simplest fare.

Clement seems to roam through the fields of knowledge picking every beautiful flower that comes in his way, without stopping to think how it will harmonise with the rest of his nosegay. Origen is of quite another

type, laborious, erudite, critical, always desperately in earnest. He saw into things far more deeply than Clement. Clement has no doubts; Origen has many, and he drags them all into the light, in full assurance that there is an answer, and that God has somewhere revealed it. Scripture must be a sufficient key to all spiritual truth, and so he collects manuscripts, revises texts, publishes the *Hexapla*, ransacks the stores of grammar, science, philosophy, and brings all this mass of human learning to bear upon the sacred text. This is, of course, very much what we do ourselves, but still there is a broad difference. The modern scholar wants to see the Bible exactly as it is, and is prepared to admit that revelation is limited by its purpose and by the circumstances under which it is given. Origen, holding the great Platonic maxim that God is all in all, and all in every part, maintained that the whole body of truth lies hidden in Scripture. Any sentence, any word, rightly and fully explained, is a microcosm, and involves all heaven and all earth, like "the little flower" of which Tennyson sang. Hence the Bible is the one book needful. Science is not a revelation so much as the key to a revelation; it is that "key of knowledge" of which our Saviour spoke, a necessary instrument for the commentator, but of no value except as an instrument.

It has been said that self-limitation is the condition of strength. Origen is certainly limited. The realm of beauty in nature and art, in which Clement finds a keen enjoyment, does not exist for him. All his great faculties were bent with superb energy on the establishment of ecclesiastical knowledge; theology swallows up everything. It is true that his conception of theology is broad and noble, and that he accomplished great

things in every department of the science. Still he is ecclesiastical, professional, and judges everything from the one point of view. He said of philosophy, "Few are they who have taken the spoils of the Egyptians and made of them the furniture of the tabernacle." Clement wrote: "There is one river of Truth, but many streams fall into it on this side and on that." There are dangers on both sides; but Clement's view is the more genial, the more modern, and, we may add, the braver.

The teaching of the Alexandrines was shaped to meet the problems of their times. They are the problems of all times, but from age to age they take different forms, and the solution, as far as a solution can be attained, needs to be continually revised.

We may take first their treatment of Scripture, and here we must think chiefly of Origen.

He held that the Bible is one book, "the Word," and not "the words," of God. Till the other day every one would have repeated this phrase; it is the expression of what was called "the plenary inspiration" of Scripture.

But, when the scholar began to study the recently completed canon of Scripture as a whole, he became aware of numerous and grave difficulties. Manuscripts were corrupt, and readings varied. There were discrepancies of statement between one writer and another. There were divergences of view between one apostle and another. The mysticism of St. Paul is not quite the same as the mysticism of St. John, and neither could be reconciled without some effort with the strong discipline of the existing Church. What then was the function of Law? and what was the precise

relation of the Mosaic Law to the Gospel? in what sense was it abolished, and in what sense did it still endure?

Other questions were forced upon Origen from the outside, by heathen thinkers like Celsus, or by Christians like Ambrosius, who had felt the attractions of Gnosticism. One was the homeliness, and, as it seemed to the rhetorical taste of the day, the vulgarity of the Scripture narrative. Another was the contradiction between Scripture and science or common sense, for instance in the account of Creation. Above all, the morality of the Old Testament was vehemently impugned from many different sides by Ebionites, Gnostics, and enlightened pagans. Men pointed to the naïve anthropomorphism of the Hebrew Scriptures, to the polygamy of the Patriarchs, to the wars of extermination, to the fierce language of some of the Psalms, to the story of Tamar, and asked in what sense a book which contained all these extravagances could be regarded as divine. Some went so far as to ascribe the authorship of the Old Testament to an inferior and evil god.

The Alexandrines were not troubled by those theories as to the date and composition of the different books which have been suggested in our own times by Greek and Hebrew philologers. How Clement would have regarded the refinements of modern scholarship may be doubtful, but that noble and intrepid spirit, with which he compared philosophy to God's rain falling on all kinds of soil, and causing all kinds of seeds to grow, was hospitable to truth from whatever quarter it came. Origen's mind was not so open, and when we remember how he refused to be convinced, even by Africanus, that the story of Susanna was not

an integral part of the Hebrew book of Daniel, on the ground that it is not well "to remove the eternal landmarks which those set up who were before us," we may guess that he would have looked with a jealous eye on the audacities of German scholarship. He was far from being uncritical, and ventured to question the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews. But theological caution, strange as this may sound, was a strong feature in his character, and, if he had yielded assent to the modern view of the Book of Genesis, it would have been after a severe struggle. But this has been the experience of many among ourselves.

The grave perplexities which attach to the idea of Evolution were of course unknown to the Alexandrines. Evolution may be compared to the spear of Achilles; it heals at any rate some of the wounds which it causes. In particular it has supplied a sufficient answer to the moral problems of the Old Testament, by telling us of "the light which slowly broadens down," and how, in all manifestations of the eternal law, the lower must always prepare the way for the higher. The fine intelligence of St. Augustine had grasped this idea at least in its ethical application, and in a remarkable passage of the *Confessions* the saint defends the morality of the Hebrew Scriptures on this very ground. In the days of his Manichæan wilfulness he too had measured the past by the stiff rule of the present. "I did not know," he writes, "the true inner righteousness which judges not conventionally but by the upright law of Almighty God, whereby the customs of countries and times are adapted to the countries and times, though the law is the same everywhere and always." But Origen had

not risen to this height. Like all the men of his day, and many men of our day, he thought that the precept was as unchangeable as the principle.

Hence, as he could not and would not strangle his doubts, he was driven to adopt that mode of interpretation which we call Allegorism. It had been invented by pagans to defend their myths, and came to Origen stamped with the approval of Philo and Clement. But he greatly extended its application, using it with the utmost freedom for four different purposes—(1) as a weapon of defence ; (2) as a means of demonstrating the unity of Scripture ; (3) as an engine of prophecy ; (4) as a necessary interpretation of the dogma and discipline of the Church.

Allegorism in our times is almost universally misunderstood. Quite recently the author of an excellent work upon Clement, M. de Faye, has spoken of it as "resting entirely upon fiction." It is indeed "the art of making one thing mean another." But then everything does mean something else. Everything is symbol. Every atom is vitally linked to its neighbour atom, and every effect is an image of its cause. Undoubtedly there is such a thing as analogy ; but some analogies are much deeper than others, and if we cannot distinguish between the trivial and the profound, there is, of course, great possibility of error.

The Alexandrines fell into this error, but this must not blind us to their great merit. They were allegorising when they found in the number three hundred and eighteen, the number of the servants of Abraham, a type of Christ. But they were also allegorising when they said that God is Spirit and not matter, or when they said that the presence of Christ in the Eucharist

is not corporeal. The fact is that many of us are allegorists without knowing it. And we may admire the hard fate of the Alexandrines. The trivialities of their symbolism were found interesting and edifying, were eagerly caught up by the Church and lived on till the other day. Their noble evangelical spiritualism, except as regards the doctrine of the Trinity, was rejected by the Church, was recovered only by a few, and only after a bitter struggle. We forget that this too is Allegorism and Alexandrinism.

The working rule of Allegorism was that Scripture contains three senses, the literal, the moral, and the spiritual, and that many passages possess all three. Origen added to this rule another, that many passages have no historical truth at all, because in the literal sense they contain impossibilities. Such were the whole account of Creation and the Fall, many precepts of the Law, and some even of the Gospel—for instance, the command to pluck out the offending eye. The main fault of these rules is just that they are rules. All language descriptive of spiritual experience is metaphorical, and has more senses than one. But when we set to work upon a text with the conviction that the more erroneous or the more trivial it may appear, the more profound must be its significance, or that the New Testament must lie hid, not merely in germ but in actual detail in the Old, great errors are at hand. They are errors not of substance, because the rash Allegorist finds only what he already possesses, but they confuse to an intolerable degree our knowledge of the past.

Yet Allegorism rests on profound truths, that "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life," and that "nothing

unworthy ought to be believed of God." It insisted that the whole world was made by God and bears His sign-manual. Further it maintained that the Bible, being the creation of the same author as Nature, must necessarily exhibit the same method of workmanship ; this was the thought from which sprang Butler's *Analogy*. Yet again that the Old Testament is not against the New, but is part of one Divine scheme for the education of the world, and contains previsions, foretastes, shadows of the better things to come. These are great thoughts, however they may have been misapplied.

But we must pick up our thread again, and consider in sufficient detail the four uses to which Allegorism was applied.

Its apologetic worth varies very greatly with the character of the objections against which it was directed. The homeliness of Scripture, which shocked Origen, does not shock us. We see no difficulty in the wells of water which Caleb gave his daughter, or in the cakes which Abraham baked, or in the touching story of Ruth. Our taste has been formed upon the Bible, and we condemn the vapid Byzantine rhetoric, which had no dignity because it had no simplicity. But many of the doubts urged by the Gnostics, or by the keen and haughty Celsus, were of a very different type. Among the chief was that arising out of the justice of God. They were all answered by Allegorism, but we need not dwell upon them here, as we must recur to the more important later on.

Neither must we linger on the second use. Types and prophecies undoubtedly exist in Scripture, though our modern scholarly ways teach us to be much more discreet in their discovery and application. Few will

doubt that Isaiah foresaw the advent of our Lord, though but darkly as in a glass. The Alexandrines—Origen more especially—were carried much too far in their desire to make all Scripture eloquent of Christ. It was the fault of their time; after all it was not a grave fault, and what we have said upon the subject will amply suffice.

A much more serious question, arising out of the belief in the unity of Scripture, is that which concerns the relation of the Law to the Gospel. It lies at the bottom of much of the religious confusion of our own times.

In what sense was the Law abolished? Is the Gospel itself a law? Is obedience to a law, which as yet we imperfectly comprehend, a duty, a virtue, and a help? Or are we to regard all true believers as a law unto themselves, or as so informed by the Holy Spirit that they need no rule and see for themselves exactly what they ought to do and believe?

The question is by no means an idle one. Epiphanius, the Gnostic, taught that the precept makes the sin. Nature is not chaste; or, as he expressed it, "the vine welcomes both the sparrow and the thief." Since his time many so-called Christians have looked upon the Gospel freedom as implying moral anarchy. This is putting the difficulty in its most brutal shape, but it has many milder forms. Can there be any moral and religious worth in belief in the Unknown, or, to use the common phrases, in Faith and in Authority? Does the Act affect the Motive, or, in other words, what is the value of good works, and what is the place of moral philosophy? What is the precise meaning of Continuity in the spiritual life? Does the present

grow out of the past, or are there breaks and new beginnings? And if history, both in the Church and in the individual, is a development, how are we to distinguish between growth and degeneration? What is Unity, and by what means is it secured? These are crucial questions arising out of the connection between the Old Testament and the New. The answer we give them marks us off as belonging to one or the other of the two great types of Christianity.

The Alexandrines ranged themselves emphatically on the side of authority. They held that the Creed itself was a law, which must be accepted before it could be understood, like the axioms of metaphysics or the rules of a practical art. The only difference is that the Christian Creed belongs not to what Whichcote calls "things of natural knowledge, or of first inscription in the heart of man by God, which are known to be true as soon as ever they are proposed," but to revelation. "The great things of revealed truth," Whichcote proceeds, "though they be not of reason's invention, yet are they of the prepared mind readily entertained and received." This is a good statement of the Alexandrine position. The Christian revelation is a manifestation of the higher reason of God, and is possible only because it completes the "truth of first inscription." We could not have "invented" it, but the "prepared mind" can recognise it. The mind must be prepared by discipline, because the truth is largely, indeed fundamentally, moral. From this point of view action under discipline becomes of very high importance.

The Alexandrines, no doubt, took a strictly legal view. When we use the word legalism we are thinking of the Rabbis, with their stiff, unchanging, slavish

mechanism. But law, as it is understood by Clement, or Origen, or Hooker, or Ruskin, is a noble thing, the guide of aspiration, the bond of unity, the nurse of freedom. Let us see what Origen says of the different kinds of law.

Take first the Law of Nature. St. Paul says in the words of the Psalmist, "There is none that doeth good, no, not one." "What," asks Origen, "was there none who sheltered a stranger, or gave bread to the hungry, or clothed the naked, or rescued the innocent from the grip of the oppressor? I do not think that the Apostle Paul wished to make so incredible a statement." He goes on to say that, though the heathen are excluded from the Beatific Vision, they cannot wholly lose "the glory, honour, and peace of good works."

The Law of Moses Origen held to have been a means of grace, adapted to the times though imperfect, transitional in form but not in substance, absorbed and transfigured but not abolished by the Gospel. It corresponds to a stage of the Christian experience, that of "washing." Men must be washed before they can be clothed, before they can "put on Christ." "Let Moses, therefore, wash thee. . . . It is the law of God which washes thee, cleanses thy filth, removes, if thou wilt hear it, the stains of thy sins."

Even the Gospel itself is constantly spoken of as a Law. Origen distinguishes three stages of Justification. The first is that of Faith, which, if accompanied by Repentance, receives pardon through Baptism. The second is that of "imputed righteousness," of imperfect obedience, of hope on man's side and on God's. The third is real and true righteousness; the man is righteous, a son and no longer a servant, a man not a babe,

and no further imputation is needed ; hope has given way to love.

To the Alexandrines, as to all Platonists, Law is Freedom. Freedom is not self-assertion, but inner conformity to the perfect will of God.

Origen is more practical than Clement, and did not believe that man can become absolutely one spirit with the Lord in this short life. Clement, as was said above, is more mystical. His "Gnostic," or finished Christian, lives in uninterrupted communion with the Saviour, and needs no helps, forms, or symbols of any kind, except the Eucharist. But there is a very broad distinction between Clement and some of the later mystics. He would have said that the Gnostic must still obey, for the sake of others if not for his own. Though he needs no forms others do, and therefore he will still go to church, hear sermons, say his prayers, and observe the customary regulations. The Body must care for all, the weak as well as the strong, and the saint is still a member of the Body. Clement was no Quietist, nor would he have broken unity for a form which his brethren valued.

The Alexandrines did not differ from the Church of their time in their notion of unity, or in their belief that all Christians were not free. Where they did differ was in thinking that all Christians ought to become free, and that the Church ought to leave much more space for freedom.

Allegorism was also used as an engine of prophecy, and this was its most dangerous application. The Alexandrines craved more light than God has been pleased to give, and set to work to manufacture it ; or rather, we should say, to extort hidden mysteries from

Scripture by means of exegesis. Origen regarded the commentator as qualified for his task by a special inspiration. There is much truth in this. "Scripture," it has been said, "can only be understood by the aid of the same Spirit by whom it was given." The scholar ought to be a revealer. But he is an interpreter of prophecy, not a prophet. The prophet, as we see him in Scripture, is one who has received a direct communication from God. He does not argue or reason, he proclaims what the Voice has told him. He gives from God an order, a judgment, an intimation of things to come. The last is the function that specially belongs to him. He was not, as such, a preacher or a teacher, though the difference lies not so much in the substance of the message as in the mode of its communication.

In the time of Origen the Montanist prophetism had been practically suppressed, and the gift of prophecy in the Church was very rare. Origen had never seen a prophet; but he bent his eyes with eager curiosity towards the darkness of the future. Could not the veil be lifted? Were there not hints in Scripture? Might not scholarship and devotion attain to at least something of prophetic strain?

He found his clue in the "Eternal Gospel" of St. John, and in the text, "God shall be all in all." How far he was right in his interpretation of these words of St. Paul it is hard to say, but he took them to mean that the end shall be like the beginning, that as all came from God, so all shall return to God, and that evil will cease to be.

I need not here describe his theory of Restitution at length. He found it in Scripture, in a thousand texts, but he had previously borrowed it from Plato. From

the *Gorgias* he had gathered the belief that all pain is corrective ; by the *Phædrus* and the *Republic* he had been taught that the soul lived and sinned before it came down to earth, that the short span of its existence here is but an episode in its age-long probation, that the great drama goes on for æon after æon, till at last, one by one, all spirits have found rest in the bosom of God. All this Origen held only as a speculation, as a hope or pious opinion. There are many passages where he expresses doubts.

It is a very bold and a very noble theodicy. We need not criticise it in detail. But one point involved is of such far-reaching importance as to call for a few remarks.

The belief that all pain is corrective is certainly wrong, and it is most singular that neither Clement nor Origen perceived this. How could they, on this Platonic theory, account for the death of our Lord, and the efficacy of the Cross ? Or how could they explain the patent fact that ignorance and hardness are not only the cause but the effect of vice ? Origen has more than one fine passage on the value of the deaths of martyrs and heroes, but somehow he never pushed the thought of vicarious suffering to a conclusion. The heathen Platonists laughed at the idea of an unjust man being made better by the unmerited suffering of the just, and many Christians are half-ashamed of it. Yet, if self-sacrifice is not the chief agent in moral regeneration, what becomes of the Church ? My pain may make me better, but why should I suffer for others who can only be healed by their own pain ? Thus we lose the noblest of all motives to which the dullest of mankind will respond.

The doctrine that pain is corrective means, in coarse language, that moral evil is cured by flogging. This is so manifestly untrue that the Church could never wholly believe it. Yet the old disciplinarians came very near to the belief. The death of Christ, it was held, availed to purchase free pardon for the sinner at his baptism, but all subsequent misdeeds must be atoned for by full satisfaction. Here we have the root of the mediæval doctrine of Penance with all its abuses. Tetzel stands on the same ground as Origen.

The last point that we need consider is the bearing of Allegorism upon the doctrine and organisation of the Church. On this field it rendered its noblest services, but within the limits at our disposal it is not possible to do more than briefly point out the chief of them.

Down to the end of the second century theology had been sadly hampered by Stoic materialism. The soul was very generally regarded as possessing shape and capable of division. The Platonists, who hardly existed in the first century and did not acquire wide influence till rather late in the second, were the men to whom we owe the interpretation of our Lord's words, "God is Spirit." Here we have the most conspicuous justification of Clement's love for philosophy. The tremendous importance of this new view—we may call it new, for it had been practically lost—is best seen in the life of St. Augustine. The belief that God has neither body parts nor passions, that His Spirit is all in the whole and all in every part, and that consequently it is not a bare logical or mathematical unity but the fulness of life, destroyed Gnosticism with its second and evil god, destroyed Chiliasm, greatly strengthened the conviction of the soul's immortality, and rendered

it possible to explain, at any rate in some degree, the mystery of the Creed. Further it explained also the Church itself, because it showed how men may be one with each other and with God. Unity in diversity is a great spiritual allegorical truth, and we owe its currency to the Alexandrines.

There were differences in detail between Clement and Origen, but it may be said that they made the doctrine of the Trinity what it has since remained. The main task left to religious thought was the definition of our Lord's Humanity. In this field the rather old-fashioned Platonism of the Alexandrines was to some extent a hindrance.

Almost equally conspicuous is the working of their free spiritual liberality in the region of practical theology. Here Allegorism is what we term Evangelicalism. But here they were ages before their time.

We find it difficult to estimate their service because so little is known of the actual working of the Church in their day. Great changes were taking place. Down to the time of Clement there is good reason for thinking that the Bishop of Alexandria had been elected and consecrated by the city rectors. The liturgy was assuming its final shape, and the power of the priesthood was becoming much greater. We can see that Clement's use of philosophy excited violent opposition among those whom he calls "Orthodoxasts," and Origen also was clearly not in harmony with "the simpler brethren." In later times the hatred of Origen was justified mainly by his Universalism and his Subordinatianism, but in his own day there were many other causes of dislike which it is not difficult to find. The Alexandrine attitude was at once too spiritual and too

conservative for the drift of the time, which ran strongly in the direction of stricter discipline and closer definition.

At what date was the *Epiclesis*, or Invocation of the Holy Spirit, in the prayer of consecration altered? If we could only answer this question, we should gain a great accession of light.

The ancient *Egyptian Church Order* has, "We pray Thee instantly that Thou send Thy Holy Ghost upon the sacrifice of this Christian Church." Equally broad is the language of the old Nestorian *Liturgy of SS. Adæus and Maris*. But in the great bulk of the Eastern Liturgies the Holy Spirit is invoked to "make" the bread and wine the Body and Blood of our Lord. And by the end of the fourth century, Jerome, a Western, says of the priest that he *conficit corpus Domini*. The Body is material, and it is "made" by the celebrant, no longer by the Holy Spirit. Here we discern two very important steps in advance. The early Church had been content to take our Lord's words as they found them, without any attempt at definition.

Origen found the doctrine of the Corporeal Presence in existence, but he could not accept it, partly because he held a low view of our Lord's Humanity, which he regarded as little more than the veil of His Divinity, partly because his Platonism made any approach to materialism impossible. Like Clement he held a purely spiritual view of our Lord's presence in the Eucharist. But what we should notice is that this Evangelicalism—shall we call it so?—is part of his philosophy, of his Allegorism. He does not deny "the common explanation," nor does it make him furious. But he relegates it to "the lower life." The body of the Church holds

it, and may hold it, but the educated Christian may think otherwise. He claims for himself and for others full enjoyment of the liberty which God has given, yet without a thought of breaking communion.

Another grave question was that of Penance and Absolution. The old discipline of public confession in the Church had been found to be more than men would endure, as we can well understand. People were beginning to ask whether it was really necessary that every peccadillo should be laid bare before an assembly in which there would be many rigorists and possibly some enemies. Hence there grew up among the wealthy a custom of attaching to their households a spiritual adviser, as the rich heathen had a domestic philosopher. These directors were often laymen, but often also priests, and a priest in this position would be naturally disposed to give absolution on his own authority, and on his own private knowledge. Origen complains that there were many priests in his own time who ventured to forgive even mortal sins "by their own prayer." Not only did he oppose private absolution, but he held, like Cyprian, and like Wyclif, that the "power of the keys" depended on the worthiness of the minister.

All this was too spiritual, too conservative for the Church of his time. Men took from Origen what they liked, and reviled him fiercely for what they did not like. They could not understand how he should be against them on some points, when he had been with them, heart and soul, in others. He seemed to be not only an opponent but a traitor.

Now what lesson are we to draw from the Alexandrines? Perhaps the reader will be best pleased if

he is left to draw his own. There are points on which we are all in deep agreement with them, points on which, for one reason or another, everybody will be against them. Yet a few inferences may be suggested.

The first is that we can no more go back to the time of Origen than we can to that of Pope Innocent III. Theology has been immensely changed by the Augustinian doctrine of Grace, and by Anselm's doctrine of the Atonement, which, with all its defects, was an abiding gain to religious thought; and our practical problems are not the same as those of Origen.

A second is the vital necessity of free thought—free not because it is wilful, not because it is built on alien premises, but because it has risen with Christ and can see all things as they are in Him. Two great marks of free thought are that it is not contentious, and that it makes for unity. It springs from faith, it is widened by discipline, and it is blessed with unction.

A third is that of all symbols it may be said "the best of this kind are but shadows." As shadows they are true, yet but shifting and impermanent. They have a spiritual meaning; we do not invent it; but they are helps which always tend to become hindrances as we advance towards the realities. "They shall perish, but Thou shalt endure."

Lastly, may we say that one of the chief lessons that the Alexandrines have to teach us is to be found in that doctrine of reserve which Englishmen incline to regard with suspicion and even with abhorrence? We are a political race, talking publicly about everything, inclined to regulate everybody's opinion, waxing hot against contradiction, and using adjectives of absurd intensity. We could not get on at all in private life unless we agreed

sometimes "to banish politics." The Alexandrines proposed to banish religious differences, and let every good Christian enjoy a sphere of liberty in his own inmost convictions. They thought it not only right, but quite natural, that one man should be High Church, and another Low. But they knew that this reign of tolerance could not endure, if each was to flaunt his views in the face of his neighbour.

One day all differences will be composed in the light of the eternal day. Meantime the Church is richer and more truly one for embracing in her Catholic bosom every aspect of the infinite truth. All aspects are partial, but aspects of truth can never be really antagonistic.

CHAPTER IV

THE AGE OF COUNCILS

By the Rev. G. A. SCHNEIDER, M.A.

The fourth and fifth centuries form an important epoch in the history of Christian thought, for they are the age of Creeds and of General Councils. During this period the great doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation, hitherto partially apprehended and tentatively formulated by leading teachers, were more fully developed. And since the need for accurate definition of Christian truth had come to be more strongly felt, General Councils of the Church were held, at which these doctrines were embodied in authoritative Creeds. In this work Eastern Christendom took the principal share.

Christianity is the Revelation of God in the Person of Jesus Christ. Christ is not merely the Teacher, not merely the Founder, not merely the Example, but Christianity is based on His Person, is inseparable from it—indeed, He constitutes Christianity. Accordingly the Church felt from the first that the Person of the Lord had a unique significance. The first duty of the disciple was allegiance to Him; the secret of strength was union with Him; the life obtained through Him was more than human life. Thus the Lord's divinity was from the beginning the guiding principle of the Church. "Jesus is Lord," was the first Christian confession. In the thought of the early Christians Christ, though born

into this world as one of our race, was far exalted above every creature.

Next to this, there was another fundamental principle, one which the Church had inherited from Judaism, one which in view of the surrounding heathenism it was constantly called upon to assert and to maintain, namely, the unity of God.

The difficulty was soon felt of reconciling with each other these two principles, the divinity of Christ and the unity of God. If Christ is in the fullest sense a divine being, are there not two Gods? How then can the charge of polytheism be avoided? The problem might be approached from two different sides, and two opposite forms of error were possible, both of which occurred in the early Church. On the one hand, a rationalizing tendency was at work which endeavoured to maintain the unity of God by denying to Christ divinity in the highest sense, regarding Him as a man in whom a divine power dwelt, and who was raised to divine honour because of His obedience to the Father's will. Such was the Ebionite view. On the other hand, a mystic tendency was at work which sought to maintain the unity of God by denying the personal distinction between Father and Son, so that Father and Son are not two separate Persons, but two successive manifestations of the One divine Person. This was the view of the Sabellians.

Both of these extremes were condemned as heresies, yet the teaching within the Church itself was still indeterminate. Many problems were still unsolved concerning Christ's relation to the Father. If Christ is the Son of God, what is the nature of this Sonship? Had the Son a beginning? If not, how can He be Son at

all? And if He had a beginning, does not this imply that He must have been created, and is He not then a creature? On these questions the Church of the first three centuries gave no clear answer. Not indeed that the Church was heretical, for there is a broad line of distinction between heresies and defective stages of Christian knowledge. The early Christians felt within them the power of the new life which they had received from their Lord; they were filled with love to Him; they were ready to accept all that the New Testament Scriptures revealed of Him. But then it was not fully understood as yet what they did reveal, and so various inadequate hypotheses were put forward concerning His Person.

For all that, progress was made by Christendom at large in the apprehension of this doctrine. Some of the difficulties were cleared up by the ante-Nicene Fathers. Tertullian (about 200 A.D.), who was the first writer to use the word "Trinity," was the first also who taught expressly that tripersonality belongs to the one God as He is in Himself. The Son is of the same essence as the Father, and Tertullian compares their relation to each other with that of the tree to the root, the ray to the sun, the river to the fountain. Yet Tertullian falls short of the full truth. The Word of God, the second Person of the Trinity, is with him at first the impersonal reason of God; He does not emerge into separate personality till the work of creation is to commence. Thus the Trinity is not one of essence, but merely an economic Trinity. Not long afterwards Origen (about 230 A.D.) cleared up the significance of the generation of the Son by the Father, showing that it does not denote any definite act, either in time or before time, but an eternal

relation. From all eternity, and to all eternity, the Son has His being of the Father, just as the will proceeds from the mind, and the brightness from the light. And it is erroneous to say that "there was ever when the Son was not." But side by side with this Origen holds the subordination of the Son. The generation of the Son is not by necessity of nature, but by the will of the Father; and hence the Father alone is in the highest sense God, while the Son is "the second God," subordinate to the Father, and in some not clearly defined sense inferior to His original.

By the close of the third century Western Christendom for the most part had come to emphasize the unity between Father and Son, while partially obscuring the distinction of Persons. Eastern Christians, on the other hand, following the last-mentioned side of Origen's teaching, tended to some theory of subordination, regarding Christ as a kind of secondary God. The Sabellian controversy, which had lately disturbed the East, had aroused the fear lest an acknowledgment of the unity of essence between Father and Son might lead to a denial of their personal distinction.

What was needed, in order that the Church should advance to a firmer grasp of the truth, was that the conception of deity should be revised. Christianity is indeed a monotheistic religion, but its monotheism is not the same as that of Judaism, or of Mohammedanism, or of ancient philosophy. In the latter systems God is conceived of as a far-off Supreme, enthroned in inaccessible mystery, absolutely one and absolutely simple, with an insurmountable barrier separating His creatures from Him. There can be no real union between such a God and man; no place is left on

such a view for the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation.

Our God, on the other hand, is a single, but not a simple God ; His being is complex. God is love, and love is not merely one aspect of the divine essence, but that essence in its fulness. And if God is love, He must have lived an inner life of love ; He must from eternity love Himself in the threefold relation of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Thus there is, and ever has been, a society within the Godhead. Hence, not only the Father, but the Son and the Holy Spirit, existed eternally. The generation of the Son by the Father is not a matter of will, as though the Father had chosen to have a Son, but of nature. This conception of God, we may remark, is not the outcome of metaphysics, it is a deduction from the revelation recorded in Holy Scripture.

But converts to the Church during the early centuries, whether they came from Judaism or from Heathenism, brought with them a conception of the deity at variance with the Christian idea. Not till this was given up could Christian thought advance. And Arianism, which based its entire system on this non-Christian conception of God, and which caused a stir throughout the whole of Christendom, rendered the Church the great indirect service of compelling it to reconsider and remodel its idea of divine unity.

Arianism arose about 318 A.D. at Alexandria, where Arius was a presbyter. He was a man of high character, and had been a pupil of the venerated martyr, Lucian of Antioch. His doctrinal system started from the belief in one God, who is alone ingenerate, alone eternal, alone unchangeable—and who is far exalted

above all creatures. As to the Person of Christ, Arius rightly felt that He must have had a real existence before the world, independent of the Incarnation. But wishing to avoid on one side the Sabellian confusion of persons, and on the other heathen polytheism, he denied to Christ divinity in the highest sense. The Father alone is ingenerate, the Son is generated, and Arius refused to allow any difference between generation and creation. The Arian Christ is then the created Word (Logos) of God, the highest of creatures, created before the world, through whom all other things were made—but still a creature. He is not from eternity, and "there was when He was not." Being a creature, He depends, like any other creature, on divine grace. He is morally changeable for good or for evil. Sinless He was, but He *might* have sinned like us. Arius was indeed willing to allow to Christ the title "God" and "Son of God," but not in the primary sense of likeness to the Supreme. If Arius degraded the divinity of Christ, he degraded His humanity even more. He assigned to Him a human body, but neither human soul nor human spirit, the place of the latter being taken—as he supposed—by the Logos.

Thus the Arian Christ is neither truly God nor truly man, but a being not unlike a heathen demigod, and Arius, who began by establishing the unity of God, ended by reintroducing polytheism. Such a Christ, who is neither truly divine nor truly human, cannot bridge the gulf between God and man, cannot bring the latter into fellowship with the Almighty, nor be the giver of life and immortality.

Alexander, the Bishop of Alexandria, summoned a synod of Egyptian bishops about 321 A.D., at which

Arius was condemned and excommunicated. But he was too much in earnest to desist from his teaching, so he moved to Cæsarea, and there found not a little sympathy among the bishops of Syria and Asia, many of whom, like himself, had been pupils of Lucian of Antioch.

The controversy was widespread, and caused the greatest excitement, so that when Constantine became sole ruler of the Roman Empire in 323 A.D., he felt it necessary to intervene. Not that Constantine personally understood the gravity of the questions discussed, but he was alarmed to see the East torn asunder by the dispute. After some abortive negotiations, he conceived the idea of holding a General Council, to deal both with this and with other questions which needed to be settled. During the third century local councils had frequently been the resource in controversies which agitated one part of the Church. It seemed natural then to suggest an Œcumenical Council as a means of settling a controversy which agitated the whole Church. This Council met at Nicæa in the summer of A.D. 325.

We cannot linger over the external features of the Council.[1] Suffice it to say that 318 bishops, with a number of presbyters and deacons, were assembled, and that these came from all parts of the Empire, and a few even from beyond its confines, such as Theophilus the Goth and John the Persian. Eusebius compares the gathering with the Day of Pentecost, when devout men of every nation under heaven were convened, or with a garland of flowers woven together as a bond of peace. By far the greater number were Easterns,

[1] These have been ably described in Stanley's "History of the Eastern Church," Lectures II. to V.

though seven bishops came from the West, while Sylvester, the Bishop of Rome, who was too old to come himself, was represented by two presbyters. There was a peculiar brightness and hopefulness resting over the Council. It was barely twenty years since the last and most terrible of the persecutions, that of Diocletian, had swept over the Church; several of the bishops present bore the marks of the sufferings which they had undergone for the faith. And now the Emperor had bowed before the Cross of Christ, and the bishops of Christendom were assembled at the summons and under the protection of that very power which had hitherto been the great enemy of the Church, and its most formidable rival in claiming the allegiance of mankind. We cannot wonder that to some it seemed as though the kingdoms of the world were already become the kingdom of God.

But what was the attitude of the Council towards Arianism? The pronounced Arian bishops scarcely numbered twenty; they were from Syria and Asia, and the most prominent of their number was Eusebius of Nicomedia. Hardly more numerous were the pronounced orthodox leaders; they included Eustathius of Antioch and Alexander of Alexandria. With the latter was his young Archdeacon, who was destined to become the most prominent figure, both at the Council and in the long warfare which followed it, the great Athanasius. Between these two extremes there was a large middle party. These were not Arians, for when at the commencement of the proceedings an Arianizing Creed was presented, it was angrily rejected by the Council. But neither were they definitely orthodox. They may best be described as Conservatives, that is to say, they

wished the doctrine of the Lord's divinity to be stated in such general terms as had sufficed before the outbreak of the controversy. With a few exceptions, they were not men of learning, indeed they scarcely understood the full bearing of the controversy. Their minds, too, were full of the last heresy which had disturbed the Church, Sabellianism. If Arius was in error, so they thought, his system was at least a protest against a more dangerous error, for he upheld the personal distinction between the Father and the Son, which Sabellianism obliterated. And to condemn Arianism might be to open the door to Sabellianism. We may say at once that the attitude of this large section enables us to understand why Arianism suffered a crushing defeat at the Council, and yet was restored a few years later.

It was recognised on all hands that the best mode of dealing with the question was to issue a new Creed. It was not, however, intended that this should supersede any existing Creed, but merely that it should serve as a test Creed which bishops might be called upon to sign whose orthodoxy was called in question. So Eusebius of Cæsarea, the Church historian, laid before the Council the ancient Creed of his own Church, which spoke of Christ as "the Word of God, God of God, Light of Light, Life of Life, the only begotten Son, the First-born of all Creation, begotten of the Father before all worlds, by whom also all things were made, who for our salvation was made flesh, and lived amongst men." This Creed was unanimously adopted. Its scriptural language, and the fact that it necessarily ignored the question at issue, made it acceptable to the Conservative centre ; the orthodox leaders could find no heresy in it ; and even the Arians were willing to accept it, for

it did not exclude their views. Its "God of God" was compatible with the Arian doctrine of Christ as a secondary God, and its "Firstborn of all Creation" lent itself to the interpretation that Christ was a creature made before all other creatures. The unanimity with which the Creed was accepted convinced Athanasius that it was insufficient. Now that the vital question had been raised, whether Christ was in the fullest sense God or not, that question must not be left open. If the Creed was to contain everything that Christian bishops needed to confess, it must be made to exclude the view that our Lord is a creature. Thus a number of additions and alterations were pressed upon the Council, which after much hesitation were accepted, and so the Creed of Nicæa took shape. In it the doctrine of the Lord's Person was stated as follows: "We believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only begotten, *that is of the essence of the Father*, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, *of one essence with the Father*." Lower down the words "and was made man" were added to "was made flesh," in order to exclude the Arian teaching that our Lord had nothing human but the body. At the close anathemas were appended, expressly condemning the Arian tenets. The most important additions were the two clauses "that is of the essence of the Father" (τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρός) and "of one essence with the Father" (ὁμοούσιος τῷ Πατρί). It was on the former of these that Athanasius laid the greater stress. "Ousia" is a term derived from Greek philosophy, denoting the unknown something which makes a thing what we apprehend it to be. To say then that Christ is "of

the Ousia of the Father," is to declare that His existence is an essential part of the idea of deity. In other words, it is as essential to the nature of God that there should be both a Father and a Son, as that God should be just and holy and good. Thus the existence of the Son of God is no result of the Father's will, but an expression of the Father's nature. Next comes the word "Homoousios," which is one of a group of words of similar form, that denote the sharing in a thing in common. The word then denotes that the Son is the common possessor with the Father of the divine essence. The word had Sabellianizing associations, had indeed been condemned as Sabellianizing by a previous Council, and hence was unwelcome to the Fathers at Nicæa. Nor can it be denied that, as used at first by the orthodox leaders, it failed to emphasize the distinct personality of the Son. It was only some half century later that the word was understood to convey the meaning which we now attach to it, namely, that the Son possesses all the divine attributes which the Father has.

We have said that it was only after much hesitation that the Council was prevailed upon to accept these alterations in the Creed. Indeed the bishops were most reluctant to insert in the test Creed a word which had been condemned by a previous Synod, and which was not found in Scripture. Gradually the majority came to see that there was no other way of excluding Arianism. The Arians were willing to accept every Scriptural expression that was proposed, putting their own sense upon it. It was recognised accordingly that, when a definite meaning was to be placed on Scripture passages, it was necessary to go outside Scripture for terms to define that meaning.

Ultimately they all signed the amended Creed except two Egyptian bishops; and these, together with Arius, were sent into exile by the Emperor. The great Council broke up.

But the controversy was not ended. The policy of Athanasius had been a bold one, however necessary; the majority of the Conservatives had been persuaded against their will, and a reaction was inevitable. The reaction was largely due to the Conservatives; the Arians were merely the extreme wing of those who sought to upset the decisions of Nicæa. It was not till the time of the second General Council, that of Constantinople, in 381 A.D., that Arianism was finally crushed within the Roman Empire. The strife was a long and weary one, often degenerating into personal retaliations; and we cannot do more now than indicate some of its more important features.

The great champion of orthodoxy continued to be Athanasius, who on the death of Alexander in 328 A.D. became Bishop of Alexandria, and who lived till 373 A.D. His character impressed friends and foes alike; his career was as chequered as a romance. Five times was he sent into exile, yet from the Egyptian desert he ruled his Church. Alone he stood against the Emperor, the Court, the Councils of his time. Hooker's expression, "the whole world against Athanasius, and Athanasius against it," has become proverbial. His life was consecrated to a single purpose, to witness to the co-essential divinity of the Incarnate Son of God. Athanasius has sometimes been accused of "fighting in behalf of a dogma which, when riveted on the Church, limited its intellectual freedom." But it has been well pointed out that in reality he was the champion of

personal liberty.[1] If Christ is in the highest sense God, then in Him God has entered into humanity. Thus the whole race which Christ took into organic union with Himself is ennobled. "He was made man that we might be made God." No one proclaimed to such a degree as Athanasius the dignity and consequent freedom of man, which he had learnt to see in the Incarnation of the Son of God. In this strength he could oppose single handed, and oppose successfully, the tyranny of the Roman Empire. The Arian conception of God, on the other hand, fell in with the principles of imperial despotism. The Arian God is not the God of love, but a far-off Supreme, unconditioned, incomprehensible to man, ruling by an arbitrary will which does not appeal to man's sense of justice and truth, but merely calls for unconditional obedience. It is significant accordingly that the Arian reaction owed its temporary success largely, if not exclusively, to the support of the Emperors, of Constantine in some degree, and in a larger measure of his son Constantius (337 to 361 A.D.), and of Valens (364 to 378 A.D.).

To turn now to the actual course of events, the first effort of Conservative policy was to obtain the recall of the Arian leaders on the strength of indefinite and evasive confessions. This done, they next sought to procure the exile of the orthodox leaders on any charges, political or moral, which lent themselves to the purpose. It may seem strange that Constantine should have consented to the exile of Athanasius, but probably this was not due to any change of principle or policy. He simply regarded Athanasius as a troublesome personage whose presence disturbed—what Con-

[1] See Allen's "Christian Institutions," p. 307 ff.

stantine most valued—the unity of Christendom. The third effort, marked by the Councils of Antioch (A.D. 341), Sardica (A.D. 343), Seleucia and Ariminum (A.D. 359), was to replace the Nicene Creed by some formulary which would secure the adhesion of all parties. But such an effort was doomed to failure. The Orthodox would not consent to leave the Lord's divinity an open question; hence they would not accept any colourless Creed, however unexceptionable in itself; no Creed would suffice which did not expressly exclude Arianism. Thus, if the Arians came in at one door, the Orthodox went out at the other; and, though a number of Creeds were issued, not one could secure general acceptance. Towards the close of the reign of Constantius, largely owing to the policy of the Emperor and the intrigues of the Court, Arianism obtained the supremacy; and not only the Orthodox, but also the Conservative bishops were sent into exile (A.D. 360). But this supremacy was purely artificial. In A.D. 361 the last heathen Emperor ascended the throne, Julian the Apostate. He hated all parties within the Christian Church alike; he recalled all the exiled bishops, rejoicing in the prospect of the strife and confusion which would ensue. But confronted with a heathen foe, softened too by the endurance of like sufferings, many of the Christian leaders were ashamed to continue the fierce strife. Moreover, the Conservatives were of themselves drawing nearer to the Nicene position at this time. Though still rejecting the word "Homoousios," they took as their watchword "Homoiousios," *i.e.*, they asserted that the Son is *of like essence* with the Father. The old age of Athanasius was devoted to the work of conciliation

between Homoousians and Homoiousians, though their complete union was still retarded by the Arianizing policy of the Emperor Valens, who succeeded Julian, and by other causes. A new Nicene party now came to the front, the chief leaders of which were the three great Cappadocian Fathers, Basil of Cæsarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Gregory of Nyssa. These had started with Homoiousian traditions, but "owed to Athanasius a more perfect understanding of their unaltered belief." Their great merit is that they differentiated the term "Hypostasis" from "Ousia," with which it had been synonymous at Nicæa. They used "Ousia" to designate the indivisible divine essence, and "Hypostasis" to denote the personal modes in which the Deity is realised. In a word, emphasis was laid on the distinction of persons within the Trinity, along with unity of essence: "One Ousia, three Hypostaseis." This party did much to secure the general acceptance of the Nicene faith, which by their efforts was freed from any leaning to Sabellianism.

When the Emperor Valens fell in battle in A.D. 378, the deathblow was given to Arianism. Theodosius, who became ruler of the East, adopted a vigorous policy in the interests of orthodoxy. He expelled Demophilus of Constantinople on his refusal to accept the Nicene faith, and appointed Gregory of Nazianzus in his place. He next summoned a Council to meet at Constantinople in A.D. 381, and at this Nicene orthodoxy was finally established. The Council was attended by one hundred and fifty bishops, all of whom were Easterns; it was a "General" Council, therefore, only in the wider sense that its decisions were ultimately accepted by the whole Church. There was little of the brightness which had

characterised the Council of Nicæa; all were thankful that the weary strife was at last at an end. The Nicenes and the Conservatives were now finally united, except a section of the latter who would not admit the co-essential divinity of the Holy Spirit. This latter doctrine had not been put forward at Nicæa, but in the course of time the orthodox leaders came to recognise that it was a necessary corollary of the co-essential divinity of the Son. Some thirty-six Conservative bishops, however, were unwilling to acquiesce in this conclusion, and held that the Holy Spirit was divine in some lower sense than the Son. These, who were called Macedonians or Pneumatomachoi, surrendered their churches and withdrew from the Council. Thereupon the first Canon was adopted: a formal condemnation of all the Arianizing parties, and a solemn ratification of the Nicene Creed in its original shape.

The Creed drawn up at Nicæa and ratified at Constantinople is not, however, that which occurs in our Communion Office and is generally called "the Nicene Creed." For a long time it was the received view that the original Creed of Nicæa was expanded at the Council of Constantinople by the addition of all that follows the sentence, "I believe in the Holy Ghost." But neither external nor internal evidence favours this view. On the contrary, the contemporary writers tell us that at Constantinople the original Creed of Nicæa was reaffirmed unchanged. And a comparison of the two Creeds shows us that, supposing our present Creed to be a revision of the original Creed of Nicæa, not only must a number of unnecessary and meaningless changes have been made in the latter, but—what is inconceivable—that clause on which Athanasius chiefly insisted

as laying down the Lord's full divinity in the most decisive terms, namely, the clause, "that is of the essence of the Father," must have been dropped altogether. It has been shewn conclusively[1] that the Creed now called "the Nicene" is the old local Creed of the Church of Jerusalem, revised and enlarged between 363 and 374 A.D., the revision being the work most probably of Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem. It would seem that about this period a desire was felt in Palestine to furnish the local Creed with clauses which would guard against the worst errors then current on two great doctrines of the faith, the doctrine of Christ and the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. The former doctrine could be best safeguarded by the introduction of some portion of the definition of Nicæa, including the word "Homoousios"; for the latter new clauses had to be devised. But how came this Creed to be ascribed to the Council of Constantinople? There are strong reasons for thinking that at this Council Cyril's orthodoxy was called in question, and was vindicated. If this was so, what more likely than that Cyril should have produced the ancient Creed of his Church, as he had enlarged it, and that the Council should have expressed approval of this Creed. After a lapse of time, when the exact circumstances were forgotten, it might well happen that tradition would regard the Fathers at Constantinople as the authors of a Creed which they had approved. At the Council of Ephesus in 431 A.D. no mention was made of any other Creed than that drawn up at Nicæa. At Chalcedon in 451 A.D. both Creeds were read, but, while the original Creed of Nicæa was received with enthusiasm by the members of the Council, the other

[1] See Hort's "Two Dissertations," No. II.

Creed was evidently still unknown to a majority of them. From that time onwards, however, the Revised Creed of Jerusalem gradually superseded the Creed of Nicæa. It superseded it by its own intrinsic merit, and by its greater fitness for congregational use. The Creed of Nicæa was a dogmatic standard, drawn up, not for popular use, but as a test Creed for bishops, and its anathemas made it unfit for liturgical use. Moreover, the Revised Creed of Jerusalem is really a more complete Creed. Not only does it expand the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, but it also lays down the doctrine of the two natures of our Lord in its sentence, "And was incarnate of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary." These facts need not cause distress to a Churchman of the present day. The Revised Creed of Jerusalem has yet more venerable associations than the Creed of Nicæa. It is the ancient Creed of the Mother Church of Christendom, while at the same time it embodies the most important portion of the decisions of the Fathers assembled at Nicæa.

The year 381 marks a turning-point in our history. Till then the controversies about the Person of the Lord had been trinitarian ; henceforth they are christological. That is to say, it was now recognised by all that Christ was in the fullest sense a divine Being, co-essential with the Father; but the question remained to be solved: Granted that there are two elements in the Person of the Lord, the divine and the human, what is the connexion of these two with each other? How can they be joined together to form one Person?

But on a narrowed battle-field the same tendencies of thought can be traced as in the earlier period, a more rationalizing tendency which laid stress on the

human element in the Person of Christ, and a more mystic tendency which laid stress on the divine element. The former was represented by the School of Antioch, which had always been characterised by its sober, grammatical exegesis of Holy Scripture, and by the ethical character of its theology. In the latter the moral development of man, and so too of the man Jesus Christ, was all-important ; and since moral development implies a free exercise of moral choice, freedom of the will is essential. But any mixture between the divine and the human natures in the Person of Christ would limit the freedom of the latter. Accordingly the Antiochenes regarded the union between these two natures as a loose one. The Logos has taken up His abode in a perfect man ; there is no real unity, but only a moral fellowship, yet so that the man shares in the honour and glory which belong to the Logos. For all that, the School desired to hold fast the oneness of the Person of Christ, though they were unable to explain how it comes about. Pushed to an extreme, the teaching of Antioch led to Nestorianism, according to which the Logos takes up His abode in a man created for the purpose, without communication or interchange of attributes, the result being something which it is hard to distinguish from two Persons.

The mystic tendency was represented by the School of Alexandria, who regarded the Lord's divine nature as the all-important factor in His Person. Athanasius, and the Cappadocian Fathers who follow him, insist indeed as against Arianism and Apollinarianism on the truth that Christ assumed the totality of human nature, for otherwise that portion of man which He did not

assume would have no part in the redemption. They affirm the two natures of Christ; they distinguish between the properties which belong to the Logos and those which belong to the flesh. Yet they speak of the two natures as "flowing into one"; they say that there is a physical union between the two, and that the flesh when mixed with the divine nature no longer continues in its own limitations and properties. This teaching also, when pushed to an extreme, becomes heretical. The result is Monophysitism, according to which the humanity of Christ, after the union, becomes merged in the divinity as a drop of water in the ocean, and thus practically disappears altogether.

The controversy arose soon after 428 A.D., in which year Nestorius, a presbyter of Antioch, became Bishop of Constantinople. After his arrival there he preached sermons against the title "Theotokos" (Mother of God) as applied to the Virgin Mary, which had come into frequent use. His objection was on theological, not on practical, grounds. The Virgin, he thought, should be called "Mother of Jesus," or "Mother of Christ," for she was in no sense the Mother of God; she was the Mother of the man to whom the Logos was united. In a word, Nestorius objected to transferring the human attributes to the divine Logos; he would not allow, for example, that the Logos participated in the sufferings of the human nature of Christ. Logically his doctrine implied two distinct personalities in the Lord.

Such teaching naturally excited much opposition at Constantinople. In the end, however, Nestorius agreed to accept the term "Theotokos," and the matter would probably have been allowed to rest here, had

not Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, intervened. Cyril was a great theologian who understood fully the bearings of the controversy, but he was a man of violent temper and very unscrupulous in the means which he employed. Doubtless ecclesiastical rivalry between the ancient see of Alexandria and the new see of Constantinople had a share in inducing Cyril to take up the cause of the adversaries of Nestorius. Before long, however, he turned the controversy into an attack upon the whole School of Antioch. To settle the dispute the Emperor Theodosius II. summoned a General Council to meet at Ephesus in A.D. 431. Cyril, with a large number of Egyptian bishops and monks, arrived there first, opened the Council without waiting for the Syrian bishops, and, supported by the Bishop of Ephesus, condemned and deposed Nestorius. A few days afterwards John, Bishop of Antioch, with the Syrian bishops, arrived. He in turn opened a Council, at which he condemned and deposed Cyril. Thus there were two rival Councils confronting each other; Cyril had a majority on his side, but he had proceeded with utter irregularity. The Emperor Theodosius, having to decide between the two Councils, at first ratified the deposition, both of Nestorius and of Cyril. But by extensive bribery at Court the scale was turned in favour of Cyril; the Emperor restored him, while allowing the deposition of Nestorius to remain valid. Two years later peace was made between Cyril and the School of Antioch, the former accepting a Creed drawn up by the Antiochenes, the latter agreeing to the condemnation of Nestorius. The followers of Nestorius retired into Persia and founded a separate Church, which has survived to the present day.

A further stage in the warfare commenced in A.D. 448. In that year Eutyches, the head of a monastery near Constantinople, an adherent of the Alexandrian School, propounded an opinion which went beyond that of his School, namely that, while Christ is of two natures—two natures entering into the Incarnation—yet after the Incarnation there is only one nature. Moreover, Eutyches held that the body of Christ was not of the same essence (homoousios) with our bodies. For this teaching, known as Monophysitism, Eutyches was condemned by a local Council under Flavian of Constantinople. Both Eutyches and Flavian wrote to Leo I., Bishop of Rome, who in his famous "Letter to Flavian" expressed approval of the condemnation of Eutyches, and proceeded to set forth in clear language the doctrine of the two natures in the Person of the Lord. Meanwhile Dioscorus, who now held the Bishopric of Alexandria, a man of fierce, fanatical character, who had the failings of Cyril without his greatness, took up the cause of Eutyches, and induced the Emperor to summon a Council to meet at Ephesus in A.D. 449. The result was a scene of unparalleled violence. Dioscorus, who took the chair, carried all before him by means of threats and coercion ; Leo's letter to Flavian was not allowed to be read, his legates were pushed aside, and a decree was passed in favour of Eutyches. Thus ended the *Latrocinium*, or Robber-Synod, as Leo not unjustly called it; and for the moment Monophysitism was triumphant in the East. But not for long. In the next year Theodosius II. died, and his sister Pulcheria, who practically succeeded him on the throne, was determined to break

the power of the Bishop of Alexandria. With the support of Leo of Rome she summoned a new General Council to assemble at Chalcedon in October 451. This Council ratified the three previous Œcumenical Councils of Nicæa, Constantinople, and Ephesus. It deposed Dioscorus for his crimes. It condemned Nestorianism on the one hand, Monophysitism on the other, expressing approval of Leo's letter to Flavian, and making it the basis of its own decree. This decree stated that the Lord is "perfect in His godhead and perfect in His manhood, both truly God and truly man, of a rational soul and body, co-essential (homoousios) with the Father as to His godhead, co-essential with us as to His manhood, that He is in two natures united without confusion, without change, without division, without separation (ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως), the properties of each nature being preserved and combining into one Person." The doctrine then is that our Lord assumed—not a man—but human nature, that this was perfect and complete, and that He assumed it for ever, so that it is not a mere vesture.

In bringing to a close our account of the first four General Councils we are naturally led to ask, what is the nature of their authority. At a later period the view came to be held that, when the entire Church assembled in a General Council agrees on any statement of doctrine, that statement must be infallibly certain, must indeed be received as a divinely-inspired utterance. But the actual history of the Councils is opposed to such a theory. Contemporaries did not deem it a matter of faith to believe in the infallibility of General Councils ; the language used in reference to

them by such Fathers as Athanasius and Gregory of Nazianzus is very different. Moreover, not one of the General Councils was accepted by Christendom at large without a long struggle. The story of the Arian reaction shows how lightly even the most venerable of all Councils, that of Nicæa, was respected by many, for at one Council after another during the next fifty years efforts were made to reopen the question already settled at Nicæa, and to modify the Nicene decisions. As to the Council of Constantinople, it was unacceptable in the West because of a canon which it passed bearing on the Roman primacy, and until the Council of Chalcedon in A.D. 451 it does not appear to have ranked as a General Council at all. At Ephesus in A.D. 431 the Council broke up into two rival portions, each condemning the other, and it was the Emperor who decided between the two.

Nevertheless, the decisions of the first four General Councils are of the greatest value to us Christians of the present time. They bear an important witness to the belief of the Church in their days. But that is not all. Christ promised that His Holy Spirit should be with His followers, and should guide them into all truth. So we may well believe that, when the ministers of His Church were met together for deliberation on great religious questions, with a sincere desire to reach the truth, His blessing was not withheld from them; and that in spite of human infirmities and vacillations divine guidance was vouchsafed; nay, that these very infirmities were in time overruled by Him for good. If the General Councils have obtained great authority, it is because the doctrines set forth by them are true. Such documents as the Creed of Nicæa and the

Decree of the Council of Chalcedon, though they do not contain *all* truth, will bear careful testing, both by Holy Scripture, and by the spiritual experience of men. Their guidance has been found trustworthy in the past; doubtless it will be found trustworthy also in the future.

We have said that they do not contain all truth, and it will at once be noticed that the range and subject-matter of the ancient Creeds and other conciliar definitions is limited. What they contain is mainly the theology of the Trinity and of the Incarnation. On other departments of truth, for example on the theology of the Atonement, they are silent; and in this respect they differ markedly from the Confessions of the sixteenth century. Nor is this accidental. The Incarnation is the union of God with the whole human race; the Atonement is the application to the needs of the individual soul of the blessings brought into the world by the Incarnation. Hence in the order of Christian thought and apprehension the Incarnation will have the first place. Over and above this, the thoughts of Christ's atoning work, of the guilt of sin, of forgiveness, justification, personal salvation, were much less prominent in Eastern than in Western Christendom. Such teaching is not indeed absent from any great Eastern Father, but it is not prominent. To the West it was given to work in these regions of truth, whereas the decrees of Councils were mainly due to the labours of Easterns.

But to what purpose are these minute definitions concerning the Godhead? Cannot a practical piety safely dispense with them? We answer that it is a distinctive mark of the Gospel that it makes the know-

ledge of truth indispensable for the highest service of God.[1] When our Lord says, "This is the eternal life that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Him whom Thou hast sent, Jesus Christ," He speaks of eternal life being dependent on knowledge, the objects of this knowledge being God, the only true God among many phantom gods, and He whom God sent, His Word, the utterance of His truth. Every sincere Christian will aim at righteousness of life ; this righteousness is to be obtained through Christ, and only as Christ can be explained to the intellect can He command the conscience. And though Christ is Himself the Truth, yet man—constituted as he is—cannot do without separate derivative Christian truths, communicable fragments, as it were, of the knowledge of God and of His Son Jesus Christ.

It is not a valid objection to urge that the finite cannot know the infinite, and that accordingly the human mind is incapable of forming any accurate notions concerning God. It is sufficient to answer that man is created in the image of God, and that therefore he will be able to attain to some knowledge of his great Archetype. Limitations, doubtless, there will be on all sides ; but our knowledge of the spiritual world, though fragmentary and imperfect, will not therefore be unreal or false, any more than our scientific knowledge is unreal, though this also has its imperfections due to the limits of the human faculties.

Nor again would it be a valid objection to urge that the definitions of the ancient Councils are of little

[1] The writer is indebted for several thoughts in the sequel to Hort's Hulsean Lectures, "The Way, the Truth, the Life."

value, because they were affected by the intellectual environment of those who drew them up. It is true that the *form* of these statements was determined by the philosophic thought of the age; it is true that such terms as Ousia, Homoousios, Hypostasis, rest on philosophical ideas which are not those of our present-day thought. But may not Greek philosophy have had its place and function in God's providential guidance of mankind? And the *substance* of the statements remains unaffected by such influences; it has its source in the revelation contained in Scripture, its constant verification in the spiritual experience of Christians. Yet undoubtedly the knowledge of this fact may well stimulate us to penetrate afresh through the form to the substance.

This brings us to another point of great importance. We have dwelt on the authority of the General Councils, which is unquestionably great. But, as it has been well said, their authority, like all other authority in matters of belief, is salutary only in so far as it is educative. That is to say, authority gives us valuable help towards forming a judgment; the teaching is commended to our hearts and consciences by the authority which promulgates it; but authority ought never to demand that we should accept its ruling against our own conviction. Our power of recognising truth presented to us is greater than our power of discovering truth for ourselves. Accordingly, while we have to depend on what the past generations of Christians have handed down to us as the sum of their religious experience, while without such dependence our own view is sure to be crude and distorted, yet at the same time we need to verify for ourselves what has

been thus transmitted to us. Dogmas should be to us the living expression of our own faith, and not dead forms, however venerated, recording the conviction of past generations, and submitted to without inquiry. For that truth which we have learnt to see and know for ourselves—it may be by a laborious struggle—is the only truth which has for us the power of truth. These two duties then are indissolubly united for us, to stand fast in the truth handed down to us, and to make unceasing progress in apprehending it for ourselves. "Bonds exist that men may be free; traditions exist that men may see and know." Some portion of what is transmitted will be within the range of our own experience; and when we have verified that for ourselves, it will in turn be an assurance to us of what lies above experience.

The need of such personal apprehension of religious truth is increased by the difference between the age of Creeds and Councils and our own age. At that time no truth except theological truth was ascertained by the Christian world. The main substance of the Christian revelation is the knowledge of God, and this knowledge it was given to Christendom to learn first, for this knowledge alone was indispensable to the life of faith and holiness. Thus Christians in the early ages might easily come to think that no other kind of truth was attainable by man. In this scientific age, however, in which we ourselves live, many new departments of knowledge are being cultivated. The world of man—man's past history, his thought, his language—has become the subject of systematic study. By the contemplation of nature entire realms of fresh knowledge have been opened up. Theology is called upon to

take account of this new teaching, now that traditional beliefs, such as those handed down to us in the Creeds, are placed face to face with fresh data gathered from historical and scientific research. In some instances, as we know, the result has been a disparagement of theology. Yet, in the long run, this progress of knowledge is calculated to benefit and invigorate theology. The Church is in danger at times of becoming slothful in the search after truth, and of substituting for truth a belief which has been merely handed down and accepted without inquiry. It will be stimulated afresh to pursue and value truth, when it is called upon to instruct those who are already trained to learn and value truth and cannot rest satisfied with anything lower than the truth. Furthermore, just as it will be the duty of Christians to carry the light which they possess into all the regions of knowledge, to show that, only as Christianity is accepted as true, can a purpose be discerned in the universe, and that the Gospel alone can assign to each separate truth its fitting place and use in the life of man, so Christianity in turn will reap a reflex blessing. The more the Gospel is used to illuminate other departments of knowledge, the better it will itself be understood. The progress of knowledge will bring in its train a growing sense of the vast range of the truths of the Gospel, and of their power to fulfil all the varied needs of men. Every addition to our knowledge of nature adds to our knowledge of God. To take but one instance, there can be no doubt that those who drew up the words of our Creed, "Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible," thought of God as an Artificer, forming the universe at once by a single creative act. If in the

present day we have come to think of this world as the close of a long process of transformation, and of ourselves as slowly developed through an ascending series of lower beings, the great truth witnessed to by our Creed stands unchanged, namely, that all things are of God—while yet the new view, so far from diminishing, will greatly increase our reverent awe and admiration of the divine working. Thus increased knowledge of the earth may lead to increased knowledge of things divine.

Lastly, in considering the Creeds and the decrees of General Councils, we must be on our guard lest their metaphysical character should at any time veil from us their deep moral significance. The history of the Eastern Church may serve here as a warning. The leading Fathers, indeed, such as Athanasius, did not forget, in the midst of their controversies, the claims of practical godliness. But with some the love of contention on speculative points was so great that it well-nigh destroyed true piety and Christian charity. And this attitude brought its own punishment. The result was a growing sense of the importance of holding orthodox views, an increasing respect for authoritative decisions as to what ought to be believed, and an almost morbid anxiety to brand as heretical all teachers whose views did not conform to a recognised standard. Hence the East came to be bound in the fetters of traditionalism, and all creative life, all advance in the apprehension of Christian truth, came to an end about the sixth century. It shall not be so with ourselves. The sentences of the Creeds place before us a summary of Christ's life on earth, and that life is for us the expression of His nature. When they tell us

that "He was made man, and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate, that He suffered and was buried, and the third day He rose again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven," they rehearse to us what may be known of One whose love to us is immeasurable, to whom we owe our own selves, with whom we are to enter into the closest union and fellowship. And those clauses, too, which assert Christ's divine nature, His pre-existence from eternity, His equality with the Father, will be pregnant in meaning for the Christian believer ; he will find much in them for daily practical application, for they teach our Lord's supremacy over the realm of nature and the realm of grace, over our own conscience and over the whole moral world.

CHAPTER V

THE LATIN CHURCH

By the EDITOR

We know what the old Romans were like, whose heroic tenacity overcame the fleets of Carthage and the genius of Hannibal. Hard, narrow, brutal men they were, who never stuck at any cruelty, full of class pride and utterly unconscious of any duty to aliens, great soldiers and great rulers, with much taste for law and little for philosophy, and even less for spiritual things. Religion, indeed, was real enough among them, pervading life with ritual, but not with virtue. The state had its gods, too, as well as the family, and enforced their rites whenever it thought fit, for private judgment in the choice of gods was a public danger. Religion was purely social and ceremonial, and had nothing to do with truth or virtue. To give the gods their due was piety: to know the ritual was holiness.

The conquest of the world brought mighty changes. The old farmers who fought the Samnite and Punic wars were extinct before the world was lost in Rome; and the sharp edges of the old Roman character were gone when Rome was lost in the world. If the old sense of public duty was weakened, the old hardness was disguised by literary polish and sensibility. The senators of the declining Empire found more pleasure in country living and literary trifling than in the heroic virtue or

outrageous vice of the past. They were much sounder morally than is commonly supposed. Yet the change was less than it seemed. The old pride of class was unabated ; and Symmachus is as careless of barbarian bloodshed as Tacitus. Indeed, the ruin of the Empire was largely caused by the truly Roman greed of these polished aristocrats, who laid field to field without a thought either of the danger of the state or of their duty to the Roman poor and to the barbarian stranger.

God sometimes teaches by revolution ; and something of that duty was learned in the crash of the ancient world. But in the main, the Roman Church is like the Roman state before it. Her popes are commonly lawyers and administrators like the old proconsuls, hardly ever thinkers or philosophers. Her first word by Clement is of law and order ; and of law and order is her last word by Leo XIII. A noble work she did for law and order in the evil days of barbarian confusion and feudal anarchy, and it would be ungrateful to refuse her full admiring homage for it ; but with law and order she has always been content. She never greatly cared whether her law and order was that of charity and truth. She always aimed at something of a military discipline ; and there is something of military sharpness even in the noble collects of Leo and Gelasius. So for law and order she has outraged nature, trampled on charity, and shut her eyes to truth far more deliberately than any other great Church.

"The Church of God which sojourneth in Rome" was a Greek colony which needed time to become thoroughly Latin. It is the converse of Rome's own great colony at Byzantium, which took a long time in becoming a thoroughly Greek Constantinople. Hints of

the character already shaping may be found on Clement's grave plea for order in "the Church of God which sojourneth at Corinth"; in Soter's behaviour as a Father of Christendom; in the appeal of Irenæus to the great central Church whose orthodoxy was kept fresh by never-failing streams of travellers; in the statesmanship of Victor; in the practical compromises of Callistus with the spirit of his own time. But the Latin theory was not developed in Rome herself, but in another great colony of Rome across the sea. The first great utterance of the Latin spirit came from the Roman centurion at Capernaum, who imaged the Saviour of the world as the *Imperator* of the host of heaven; and its first great development was due to the son of a Roman centurion at Carthage. Tertullian showed how to shape the Gospel by the principles of Roman law. The faith is an estate committed to the Church by Christ; and now that heretics have arisen to dispute her title, there must be no appeal to Scripture. The Church has the truth and does not need to seek it. Heretics have no property in Scripture, and get inconvenient arguments from it. The Church will do best by refusing to touch the merits of the case at all. She has only to enter a demurrer of uninterrupted possession, then judgment must be given in her favour. The argument is simple enough, but it is not conclusive unless we assume either that there is no such thing as gradual change of doctrine, or else that such change is always and without reserve legitimate. Nor can we take for granted that an earlier age is more likely to be right than a later, unless we go back to the earliest age of all, which is practically unknown except from Scripture; and this is precisely the appeal to Scrip-

ture which Tertullian calls waste of brains and temper.

Under Cyprian of Carthage and Cornelius of Rome, the two great Western sees were held for the first time by men of the world who moved in the highest circles of heathen society. Cyprian was a born ruler of men, courteous and literary as the great proconsuls often were; a Christian man withal, and saint and martyr too. Yet Cyprian it was who showed how to shape the Gospel by the principles of Roman religion. He was a practical man, who took his ideas from the air around him without seriously thinking them out for himself; and these ideas are mostly heathen. As the heathen god's favour is strictly limited to his worshippers, so God's grace is strictly limited to the visible Church. As the idol's favour is dispensed by the priests, so God's grace is dispensed by His priests the bishops—for Cyprian would have been as horrified as any Protestant at the impiety of turning presbyters into priests. As a Roman magistrate held a defined authority by regular transmission, so it must be, and so it must always have been, with the Christian ministry. Thus sound doctrine is guaranteed by the outward succession, and the legal questions of a valid transmission become vital. Cyprian starts from the unity of the Church, which practically means with him the visible unity of a visible society ruled by an aristocracy of co-equal bishops. The Christian priesthood differs from the Jewish in nothing but its permanence. He might have added, that it is precisely like the heathen except that it is not the priesthood of an idol.

The bishop is the priest, and resistance to him is the sin of Korah. No grace outside the Church.

Baptism will save the infant, and martyrdom the catechumen; but as for one who never heard the Gospel, or wandered into heresy, or died out of communion with the bishop—no innocence, no virtue, no repentance, not even death for Christ, will in the least avail to save him from the everlasting fire of hell. In this direction Cyprian was as hard as any Calvinist. On this theory, Church pardon and divine forgiveness are closely linked together. It is plain that God forgives none to whom the Church refuses pardon; and the converse was an easy inference, that God forgives whomsoever the Church pardons.

The Cyprianic theory has long since drifted from its Cyprianic moorings. No Church but Rome now denies all salvation beyond its own limits. No Church now counts all bishops equal. No Church now counts the presbyter a Levite. In the Church of Rome he is only the bishop's deputy, but it is still the essence of his office to be a priest, not a Levite. But these are secondary modifications. In its broad outlines the Cyprianic theory, as completed by Augustine and worked by Roman bishops, has shaped the Western Church ever since, and deeply influenced both the orthodox East which never accepted it, and the Protestant North which rebelled against it.

We come now to the third great development of Latin thought. Augustine indeed was too great a man to be so purely Latin as Cyprian, and has points of affinity both with Eastern Orthodoxy and with Northern Protestantism. Yet he too is flecked with human infirmity. He never fully overcame the dualism of his old Manichean theosophy. It rather increased on him as he grew stiffer and harder in his old age, and

renounced, like Sir Thomas More, the gentler thoughts of his earlier years. But hope was hard in the age when the ancient world was overthrown. It was not the sense of sin that deepened in the deepening gloom: only the sense of God's love became less able to contend with it. The Greek Church has but one doctrine, for the Incarnation lights up all the rest: the Latin also has but one, for the rest are overshadowed by the Church. The *Gloria in Excelsis* is the voice of one, the *Dies Iræ* of the other. For us men and for our salvation, sang the Fathers of Nicæa. From this evil world to ransom his elect, replied the Western monks. Augustine's high Calvinism was not an accident of Latin thought, but represents it more worthily than the practical Pelagianism of mediæval asceticism. Cyprian had long ago declared the necessity of communion with the visible Church for salvation: Augustine accounted for that necessity by the guilt of original sin, which dooms to perdition all but those who through the Church are guided by special grace. And a change in our view of man involves a change in our view of God. All-ruling Love fades out before almighty Will, and our heavenly Father becomes a Nebuchadnezzar in heaven—whom he would he slew, and whom he would he kept alive. Latin theology rejected as sharply as Mahometanism the revelation of God as Love commending itself to us, and justifying itself at every step to the image of God within us: and fell back like Mahometanism on the idea that God is Will inscrutable—which is a form of Agnosticism. The short heroic age of Islam was fired by the conviction that the Inscrutable had somehow declared for righteousness; but a still nobler belief never ceased

to struggle within the Latin Church, for Rome never quite forgot that story of Christ crucified which witnesses to all ages that So God loved the world. Obscured it might be, and that very grievously, as by saint worship and all the rest of the carnality ; but in the Middle Ages it was never utterly forgotten. Even Augustine could not reconcile the Agnostic and the Christian ways of thinking ; and sooner or later the struggle between them was bound to tear the Western Church in sunder.

Latin theology was now complete in outline. The Middle Ages worked out one side of Augustine's teaching, the Reformers groped for another, and both counted him their spiritual father. But this African system needed Rome's imperial instinct to put on it a corner-stone. Now that the Church was as concrete as the State, it equally called for an earthly head ; and this was more than Carthage could supply. The choice lay between Rome and New Rome. But Constantinople was an upstart and a creature of the court, whereas the Roman See was apostolic as well as imperial, and by this time Latin too. When the East was torn with heresies, Rome could take a commanding tone as the mouthpiece of Western orthodoxy ; and indeed she fared badly in the few cases when she ventured to speak without the West behind her. Her supremacy begins to be practical in Augustine's time, though even then it is firmly and successfully resisted by the African bishops. As soon as Africa was wasted by the Vandals, Leo I. obtained from Valentinian III. an edict (445), which practically subjected to him the Western Churches of the Empire. Thus the first effective Roman supremacy was a grant from the State :

and it was more than the perishing State could enforce. In another generation the Empire had vanished from Italy, and Rome was subject to the Herul and the Goth: and if she was made Roman again by Belisarius, the Byzantine yoke proved heavier than the Gothic.

In her deep humiliation she began to recognise the great work before her. As the Roman State had made Southern Europe Latin, so was the Roman Church to make Northern Europe Christian. She could not make it Latin, for the Teutons have a character of their own, and even the Celts have never been thoroughly Roman. It was "Gregory our father" who cast aside the contempt of barbarians which had ruined the Empire, and laid a firm foundation for the future Papacy by his mission to the wildest of them all. The decisive step was taken when he welcomed the English to the Christian fold. The conversion of the English directly led to the conversion of Germany, and that again to the reformation of the Gaulish Churches and the restoration of the Empire in the West which delivered Rome from her Byzantine captivity.

The feud of ages was forgotten when the holy diadem of Empire was laid on the great Karl's barbarian head. The Roman and the Teuton were reconciled at last; and for a while pope and emperor worked together as twin heads of Christendom, though the emperor was much the greater of the two. Karl's own great work was the conquest and conversion of Northern Germany, which cleared the way for the conversion of Scandinavia. But the Empire of the Karlings was too weak for its work. Its strength was wasted in civil wars, and its oppressive military system broke down helplessly before the attacks of Northmen and Moors and

Magyars, which carried fire and sword throughout its bounds. Hardly a city escaped but Rome. Dark as was the outlook before the Karlings rose, it was even darker when they fell. And if civilisation was saved by feudalism from the outside enemies who were breaking it to pieces, it was only saved at a fearful cost of anarchy within.

The tenth century was one long wail of misery. Gaul and Italy were sunk in feudal anarchy, Spain in Moorish slavery: only in England and Germany stronger kingdoms had been organised by Alfred and by Heinrich the Fowler, and even they kept very imperfect order in the land, though Athelstan and Otto the Great were splendid kings. But towards the end of the century the English monarchy crashed down before the Danes, and the German was dreadfully shaken by the disaster of Cotrone in 982. Europe seemed dissolving into universal ruin. No panic of the end of the world was needed to melt the hearts of men in that day of trouble and distress, of wasteness and desolation. Small wonder if they turned away from this world's wretchedness to win by painful asceticism the glories of another. Monasticism crept into the Church in the fourth century, and was organised in the sixth by Benedict of Nursia; but now it came forth from Cluny in a sterner form to preach its gospel—of forgiveness truly, but forgiveness to be won by self-chosen and self-inflicted suffering. Asceticism despairs of the world like Calvinism, as though God could not or would not save more than a remnant; and it is as common a form of that despair for weak natures as Calvinism is for strong. The old prophet's mantle rested on the monk when he preached

wrath and doom on a corrupted Church ; but there was no power in his asceticism to purify it, for the ascetic takes as low and physical a view as any sinner of the revelation of God in common life, and the conclusion he draws from it is hardly less demoralising to the world outside his monastery.

However, the worst was really past. The Northmen had been checked by Alfred and Count Odo in the peace of Wedmore and the three years' siege of Paris ; the Magyar hosts were scattered to the winds by the great Otto on the Lechfeld, and at last the Moors were driven from Provence. But now that the outside enemies were beaten off, the internal anarchy of feudalism seemed hardly less intolerable than the ravages of the Northmen. Yet what remedy ? Kings were helpless, the Church was deeply feudalised. Fighting bishops compared badly even with fighting barons. The popes indeed had seemed for a while to rise on the ruins of the Empire. The Field of Lies was a premature Canossa ; and Nicolas I. was the most commanding pope yet seen. But the Papacy was soon swept into the whirlpool of Italian anarchy, and became the sport of harlots and factions for more than a century. It had some strong popes like Gerbert, and even the weak popes commanded a certain respect beyond the Alps. But a real reform was clearly needed. The ninth century had outlined it in the False Decretals, and provided a weapon in transubstantiation : now the work had to be done in the eleventh.

The reforming party leaned on the Empire, which had recovered its power under Heinrich III. (1039–1056). Three quarrelling popes were set aside at once, and unity and decency restored, but at the cost of sub-

jection to the Empire. The next thirty years are the critical period, in which the reforming movement passed from German to Italian hands, and developed its policy of putting down the fighting clergy, the marrying clergy, and the simoniac clergy. At a later stage the last became a prohibition of investiture by a layman, which brought it into collision with the kings. The object was to separate the Church sharply from the world, and the means thereunto was the elevation of the Papacy above the Empire. The sanction of transubstantiation came later still, for Gregory VII. does not seem to have seen the importance of the doctrine.

The Hildebrandine reformation was the answer of the Church to the world's appeal for help. We utterly misread it if we see in Gregory VII. nothing more than priestcraft and vulgar scheming. He is more like some old Hebrew prophet whom the Lord has lifted up on high, to rebuke the kings of the earth and smite its evil-doers. The aim of the mediæval Papacy was a noble one—to purify the Church into a kingdom of righteousness overlooking and controlling the world. It was a splendid service to hold up such an ideal as this to an age of wrong and violence, however the reality may have fallen short of it. Yet Rome was not unworthy of the great position which the world had thrust upon her. Nicolas of Langley was not the only pope who felt his crown a crown of fire. Rome's influence in England, for example, was upon the whole for good, from Augustine's landing till past the times of Anselm and Thomas of Canterbury. But the dilemma was hopeless. If the Church stood aside from the world, it might drain away its best elements, but it would only debase what remained; and, if it endeavoured to govern

the world, a carnal fight would have to be fought with carnal weapons. Meanwhile asceticism cooled down in spite of sundry revivals, and passed by easy stages into indifference and licence. The higher the Papacy rose, the more worldly it became. Gregory VII. began the contest with the Empire in the spirit and power of Elijah ; Innocent IV. triumphantly finished it in the spirit of Simon Magus. "The seller of sacred things is dead," said his successor.

The twelfth century is, upon the whole, a continuation of the eleventh ; but the Hildebrandine enthusiasm was dying out. Gregory himself would gladly have swept away the "brigands, and sons of brigands," as he called the kings, but his successors had to make terms with the world. The feature of its first half is the Cistercian revival, represented by Bernard of Clairvaux and in a different way by Nicolas of Langley ; that of its second is the parallel reigns of Frederick Barbarossa in Germany, and of Henry Fitz-Empress in England and Aquitaine, and the beginning by Albert the Bear and Henry the Lion of the great north-eastern expansion of Germany in Slavic lands.

The thirteenth century saw the culmination of the Latin Church and the beginning of its decline. We pass in it from the triumphs of Innocent III. to the gasconades of Boniface VIII. ; from the consolidation of Latin doctrine in transubstantiation and auricular confession by the Lateran Council of 1215 to its codification by Thomas Aquinas, and then again to its disintegration by the subtle unbelief of Duns Scotus. The panorama of events is magnificent—the capture of Constantinople, the breaking of the Moorish power in Spain at Navas de Tolosa, King John's submission and the

Charter, the extirpation of the Albigenses, the rise of the mendicants, the Mongol devastations, the last and mightiest struggle of the Hohenstaufen Empire, the Barons' War in England, the loss of Antioch and Acre, and the rise of France to a position in Europe almost as commanding as Napoleon's. This was the age of the schoolmen, the age of Roger Bacon, the age of the great cathedrals. A wave ran through the world, from the Irrawaddy to the Scottish border, from the gold and silver temples of Pagán to the minsters of York and Lincoln. So glorious was the start of the young nations of Europe. The age was one of revolution. Pope and emperor were in theory twin rulers of a Catholic world, so that the fall of the Hohenstaufens undermined the whole Catholic theory of society, and left the popes exposed alone to the impact of the growing world of nations. There was little help in the Hapsburgs put up by Gregory X. Frederick II. is emperor as well as king, but St. Louis after him and Edward I. are purely national kings. Rome's last good gift to England was Stephen Langton ; and before the century is out she has had her decisive repulse from Edward I. with a nation behind him, and this is followed by a still more disastrous overthrow from Philip of France. Universities are formed instead of monasteries built, and even the mendicants are monks of a new sort. Asceticism is coming out from the cloister to preach and teach and minister to the people, and even to share the aspirations of the people, like the English Franciscans in the Barons' War. The schoolmen show new stirrings of northern thought inside the Latin Church, for they are mostly northerners, and largely Englishmen. Even Thomas Aquinas had a father related to the Hohenstaufens, and

a Norman mother. The Inquisition, to be sure, was not northern. It was chiefly in Dominican hands, and the difference of Dominican and Franciscan is very much the difference of Spain and Italy. But its great significance—the bishops would not work it—is that the Church was ceasing to be a Church of the people, and forming a new alliance with kings and nobles rather than with peoples. Robert of Lincoln shows us what is passing away, Lewis of Beaumont what is coming.

The change from the thirteenth to the fourteenth century is well figured by this change from the learned and saintly son of a peasant to the illiterate aristocrat who could not read his profession of obedience to the metropolitan. The great Edward slept with his fathers, and an *asinus coronatus* reigned in his stead. Though the thirteenth century was no more perfect than the sixteenth—Adam Marsh had reason for his *His diebus damnatissimis*—it was almost as full of bursting life, and of promise in all directions that remained for generations unrealised. The fourteenth was a showy, hollow, barren age, which fully revealed the decay of Latin Christianity. The only wave that ran through the world in it was the Black Death. Its landmarks are the decisive defeat of the Papacy under Boniface VIII. by the new nations, its "Babylonish Captivity" at Avignon, and following this the Great Schism and the rise of Lollardism in England. Hardly less important was the failure of Monasticism. Its first ideal, falsely called chastity, was plainly impossible for men in general. The endeavour to enforce it even on the clergy was a practical failure, and had caused the most appalling evils ; and now experience was showing that the family life on which the nations

rested is purer and nobler than the monastic. Its second ideal of poverty received a fatal blow from John XXII. in 1322. For centuries the popes had been balancing between the bishops as the official heads of the great system and the monks who stood for individualism inside it; but now the very principle of the mendicants was declared contrary to Christ's example. The dead mass might go on by *vis inertiæ;* but the more earnest of the monks henceforth looked restlessly to mysticism, to new forms of association, or even to heresy. Small wonder if the Reformation (which finally discredited for Northern Europe the third monastic vow of obedience) found so many of its leaders from Brother Martin downward in the monasteries.

So in the fifteenth century we see the Latin Church in deep decay. The thoughts of the Middle Ages were thrust aside by the growth of nations, of commerce and of family life. One after another its ideals had been discredited. The emperor was the first to go. True, they had set up Cæsar in his place again; but the Hapsburg emperors were the merest shadows of their mighty predecessors. The lord of the world had shrunk into a second-rate archduke in Germany, in real power quite unequal to Charles of Burgundy. The pope went next. The scandals of the thirteenth century were followed by subjection to France and greater scandals in the fourteenth; and the culminating scandals of the Great Schism made irresistible the cry for reformation of the Church in head and members. For a while the Papacy seemed subjected to Councils. Three popes were deposed; and for a moment even the Luxemburger Sigismund could mimic a great

emperor. But the Church was too far gone for reform from within. Councils could not even limit the Papal supremacy, much less replace it by their own; and least of all did they even wish to reform the false doctrine which underlay the scandals. If they set aside an infamous pope like John XXIII. they were bound to replace him by a decent pope; and before a Martin V. they were helpless. A little diplomacy was enough to dispose of the Councils; and then the Papacy seemed restored to its former splendour.

Seemed, and only seemed, for it was but a restoration like the Hapsburg Empire, though not so badly tarnished. For the last half century before the Reformation, the serious policy of the popes is very much limited to Italy. Albigensic, Lollard, and Hussite heresy had witnessed wide and bitter discontent in Romance, Teutonic, and Slavonic Europe; and that discontent was kept in check by a threefold policy: for unbelief, however heathen, there was licence, witness Pomponazzo; for sin, however gross, there was formal penance and easy payment. "God willeth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he should pay and live"; only for attacks on Church privilege there was merciless repression. Though the records of persecution were systematically destroyed, it seems to have raged on quite as great a scale before the Reformation as after it.

Latin Christendom undertook a burden never laid by God upon His Church, and broke down under it. From being a witness of Christ and guide of men, it aspired to be a governor of men and final judge of truth, and forgot its proper work of ministration. The oversight of nations with which the Hildebrandine reformation started, developed into a systematic and

demoralising interference with government which ought to be national. Rome could not really govern nations from one centre, so she only meddled, and meddled only for the sake of gain. The oversight of private life with which the Latin Church began developed into a systematic and demoralising interference with conduct which ought to be individual. Rome could not really govern private life by any central church law, so she only meddled, and seemed to meddle only for the sake of gain. The condemnation of the Latin Church is not that great sins were done in the twelfth century, but that under her guidance sin had almost ceased to be recognised as sin in the fifteenth. She had made shipwreck of conscience in Western Europe. She had degraded the world, and yet more degraded herself, by absorbing into the Church the proper work of the nation and the individual, as though the Church were God's one voice on earth, till it was time for the world to take the Church in hand and teach it something better.

CHAPTER VI

ENGLAND BEFORE THE REFORMATION

By the Rev. W. E. COLLINS, M.A.

THE conversion of the English was but one act in the making of the great Christian commonwealth of the Middle Ages, and yet the English Church has always had a position and a character which is unique in Christendom. On the one hand, it is no more than an incident, though a most important one, in the growth of Western Christendom. On the other, the English Church is an entity from the first; and even the great convulsion of the Reformation movement, whilst it has added to our insularity and given new directions to our activities, has but emphasized and developed a determinate character which was there from the first.

It is unnecessary here to speak in detail of the work of conversion which began with the coming of Augustine in 597. Suffice it to say, that the resultant of the various forces which took part in that process was a Church and a Nation which was most intimately bound up with the West as a whole. The English peoples were still "barbarian" when it began, and as yet practically outside the pale of the historic civilisation of the West. Our conversion gave us a place amongst the infant nationalities of Europe, and left us with a strong national life which bore in every feature the impress of the new faith and the new Society. It

found us entirely heathen, although our Celtic neighbours had been to a large extent Christian for centuries: it left us not only Christians, but also, for good or for evil, bound up with the life-history of Latin Christendom. It found isolation and division: it left a strong united Church life which quickly absorbed and gathered into itself the Church life of the Celtic peoples, wherever the two came into close contact. No other result was possible. The Celtic peoples, wherever they had renounced their heathenism, were earnestly and passionately Christian. But theirs was an isolated and tribal Christianity which still retained many elements which were directly heathen. It was a private religion which, if it did not actually foster strife, at least proved itself singularly incapable of overcoming the tendencies to disunion and disintegration to which their temperament and the character of their institutions only too readily exposed them. With a few conspicuous exceptions, it seems to have been remarkably lacking in expansive power, and this in spite of a very real missionary spirit. With all its poetry and all its beauty, it showed singularly few signs of containing a Power of Life for wayfaring men.

It need hardly be said that the illusive dream must be once for all abandoned which would regard "the British Church" as one of transcendent purity, directly apostolical in origin, scriptural in doctrine, and free from papal corruptions, and which holds that this pure Church was confronted, displaced, and superseded by a corrupt and popish organisation. There can be no real question that the Christianity which the English received from the continent of Europe was far nobler than that which the Britons intentionally withheld from

them. The theology of Latin Christendom as set forth by Gregory the Great may be in some ways unsatisfying, but at least it is equal to that of Gildas the Wise. The moral life of Rome and Italy compares very favourably with that which is revealed to us in the canons of the early Welsh Synods, and certainly the level of civilised life was far higher. But above all, we were launched upon the full stream of human life and progress, instead of being drawn aside into what was after all no more than a backwash, in which certain primitive elements still survived simply because they had drifted aside out of the current. No doubt there were dangerous tendencies in the new life which were not present, or at least were hardly perceptible, in the old: such is always the case, for there is no human progress which does not involve the loss of much that is good, the generation or development of much that is merely partial or transitory, or that may become dangerous in the future. But we are not therefore at liberty to prefer that which is ready to vanish away; it does not follow that "the former days were better than these." In a word, the Christianity which we received through our fathers in the faith was immeasurably richer and higher than anything else of its own day. Of course, it is easy enough to see the imperfections of that which we received, and easy enough to set before ourselves something that should better satisfy our own imaginations. But to conclude that Celtic Christianity would have supplied this is to be absolutely at variance with the plain teaching of the facts.

For good or for evil, then, the English Church was entirely bound up with the history of Latin Christendom;

and in spite of our strongly-marked individual character we shared fully in that life. As the Gallican or the Spanish Church, or the daughter Church of Germany, became gradually more subject in consequence of the growth of the Papacy, so also did we. We shared also with them the effects of that process of gradual centralisation, and elimination of local characteristics and landmarks, which is so marked a feature of the Middle Ages. It is this, and this alone, which rendered possible that strange misuse of terms whereby people have come to speak of the greater part of Western Christendom as the Roman Church.

If we compare the circumstances of the English Church in these two respects, with those of others, it would be true to say, that (1) the English Church, which has taken the lead in emancipating itself from the papal tyranny, was in some ways even more closely connected with the Papacy than the other Churches of the West, owing to the circumstances of our first reception of the faith. The offerings which were made to the Holy See in its tribulations by grateful Englishmen grew by degrees into the earliest of papal taxes. In later days, when Honorius III. and other popes were seeking the munitions of war against the Empire, it was England which gained the unenviable honour of being *par excellence* the papal treasure-house; and many of the encroachments upon the episcopal office were essayed in England before they were extended to other nations. (2) On the other hand, our remoteness, and the sturdy independence of the English character, often delayed for a time the introduction into England of new developments of various kinds. And consequently, everything that brought about renewed

intercourse between England and the Continent was likely to bring with it some fresh impetus or some new fashion in religion. Thus the coming of the Normans led to the introduction of the revived monastic spirit and the strongly developed "High Churchmanship" which had taken so firm a hold upon their character, together with the new Frankish theory of the nature of the Real Presence in the Eucharist. Subsequent intercourse with the Continent gave us the full benefit of the Hildebrandine reformation, and later still the all-embracing system of the Roman Canon Law. One precedent led to another, and the result of each was that the English Church had become more closely involved in the toils of this great human system than it was before. And thus, little by little, the whole fully-developed structure of the Papal Monarchy cast its protecting shadow over us as it did over the rest of Western Christendom.

It is easy to see the inevitableness of this system of ever-increasing centralisation, and hardly less easy to see that it served a very real purpose in its own day. Without really making for peace, or even for a good understanding between the gradually shaping nationalities of Europe, it provided a background and an order of life which was common to them all, and thus helped to bring them into relations of mutual intercourse. In such ways it supplied the place which had formerly been occupied by the Roman Empire, and which is occupied in our own day by that interdependence of all the activities of modern civilised life which transcends all national boundaries, and has made the whole world one as it never was before. It gave the consciousness of a great unity to all the nobler aspirations of men,

thus lending to them a force which they could never have possessed in isolation. It presented an embodiment of the claims of faith and righteousness which often compelled obedience where nothing else could have done so, thus making for freedom even when its methods seemed to be those of tyranny. It supplied a sphere of education for the Christian intellect, narrow and over-rigid in itself, but so subtle and methodical that, when once the bonds and limitations were removed, learning itself formed the best solvent for that system which it had hitherto been used to defend.

In all this, and much more, England and the English Church shared quite as largely as any other part of Western Christendom. The theology current in England was not less mediæval in character; the intercourse between the English Church and the Papal See was in no way less frequent. Of all the nations of the West, as has been said above, England was second to none in deference for the Holy See. Respect for the papal office was unbounded, and for papal ordinances so far as it was convenient to observe them. It was the ordinary thing to solve dilemmas in ecclesiastical matters by having recourse to the Papal Chancery and the Curia, and this continued, by a kind of mutual accommodation between King and Pope, in spite of the legislation which from time to time aimed at restricting it. Nevertheless, during the later Middle Ages the Papacy was undoubtedly very unpopular in England. The main reason for this unpopularity was not that the system was felt to be wrong in principle: quite the contrary. When Grosseteste is writing most severely against the Papacy of his own day he does not suggest that it is

in itself an evil, but simply that the abuse of such power as the Pope possesses is a thing antichristian. And not for centuries, not until legend had given place to a truer knowledge of the history of the Church, was it possible for Englishmen as a whole to advance beyond this. But in England the Papacy was unpopular, from the thirteenth century and onward, because in its practical working it led to consequences which were very objectionable. It gave rise to continual delays and uncertainties in matters which had a very direct bearing upon every-day life. It conveyed a continual stream of good English money out of the country, and this often at times when it could ill be spared. Moreover, during the greater part of the fourteenth century the Popes were Frenchmen and dwelt at Avignon, which, if not actually in French territory, was the next thing to it; so that our money was being sent out of England virtually to support our enemies the French. Above all, great causes were continually and inevitably settled, by the power which professed to be the supreme spiritual arbiter of Christendom, upon grounds which were simply and indubitably political. Such political decisions were not always made with our interests in view, but rather against them; and it even happened sometimes that the settlement was dictated by the ambassadors of some prince with whom we were actually at war. Considerations such as these had undoubtedly much to do with the actual breach with Rome when it occurred. And yet no mistake could well be greater than that of thinking that these were the causes which led to the English Reformation, or even to the particular side of it which was concerned with the Pope—the abolition of his jurisdic-

tion in England. The fact is that the system contained within itself, in its rigidity and its one-sidedness and its ever-increasing narrowness, the seeds of its own decay. An institution which had arisen to supply the needs of the Middle Ages could not possibly be suited in the same degree to an age in which every characteristic feature of mediævalism had been shattered to pieces. The measure of its previous success was the measure of its present failure. As one transitory method of God's working, the Papacy had had its value for us and for others. But when it claimed to be not a partial agency in God's providence, but a revelation of essential truth, men came by degrees to see for themselves that it was a lie; and where they could not see, the logic of facts made it clear.

A Reformation of some kind was a thing inevitable, and not least so in England, long before the opening of the sixteenth century. Its precise nature and scope were still indeterminate, and would depend upon the circumstances which should actually give rise to it, and the persons who should be immediately concerned in it. But the thing itself was bound to come: it was the result of forces which were already in operation and of tendencies which were already at work.

(*a*) The first of these was the New Learning. There had arisen a spirit of inquiry which was no longer content to exert its faculties upon questions the answers to which were regarded as already completely known; or to accept things precisely as it found them, on the ground that they were stamped with the sanction of authority acting in and through the machinery of the Church. A great army of scholars was beginning to

look for the bases of authority in a new direction; which was inevitable when once the study of the New Testament was put in its rightful place, as the primary record of God's revelation in Christ. This, no doubt, might easily degenerate, and often did, into a literalism which was almost as slavish as the theory of Church authority which it displaced; but in itself there could be nothing more noble than the conviction of the New Learning, as it was expressed by Erasmus, that in the pages of the New Testament they might behold the Master, and know His will more clearly than if He were actually before their bodily eyes. Meanwhile an enlightened criticism was sweeping away the foundations upon which the very existence of the Papacy depended; whilst from the printing press there came forth into common knowledge the writings of the Fathers, the records of a Catholic antiquity to which the Papacy in the mediæval sense was a thing unknown. If the *Corpus Juris Canonici* had been powerful as a code of ecclesiastical law, its influence had been hardly less great as a kind of authorised commentary on the past history of the Church; and the pages of Gratian's *Decretum*, with its large incorporation of the pseudo-Isidorian decretals and other forged documents, assured the mediæval student that from the beginning things had been as they were in his own day. Whatever other learning he might have, it was this which formed the basis and pattern of all his ideas of the history and constitution of the Church. Now came the great awakening: the student learned that from the beginning it was not so. Controversialists might still dispute about isolated facts, or produce spurious or interpolated texts of the Fathers, but the case in its broad outlines was too clear. Hence-

forward, if the Papacy was to stand, it must stand on its own merits and not by any inherent right.

Nor was the necessity for its existence so clear as it had once seemed to be. The unity of Christendom was almost a necessity of thought to the mediæval mind, and hitherto the Papacy had seemed to be an absolutely essential part of that unity. For the Catholicity of the Middle Ages was a very imperfect Catholicity, and Christendom was commonly taken to mean no more than the Christians of the Roman obedience. Western writers, even great writers like Gerson and Thomas More, commonly use the word Christendom in this sense; and it is therefore a significant fact when thinkers like Wyclif turn their thoughts further abroad, and conceive it as a possible thing that we should live without a pope like the Greeks. By degrees the conception of the oneness of Christendom which centred in "the Holy Roman Church, mother and teacher of Churches," began to give place to one which was at once less arbitrary and more Catholic.

(*b*) Another change which was coming over the thought of the West had reference to the relations between Church and State. According to the conception which found its strongest expression in the work of Gregory VII. and his successors, the Church was an organisation existing over against the secular organisation, and standing in contrast to it as the heavenly to the earthly. Meanwhile, largely owing to the practical neglect of Confirmation and the partial loss of the conception of public worship, the rights and functions of the layman, and the fact that he is after all the primary unit of which the Church is composed, were more and more completely overlooked. And thus the Church-

manship of the Middle Ages came to be as imperfect as its Catholicity. In practice an entire confusion was made between the Church and the officers of the Church, and when men spoke of the one they were really thinking of the other. To them the Church meant primarily the great hierarchy, from the Pope down to the lowest person in minor orders. It existed, no doubt, for the benefit of the secular world outside, but still it stood outside of and over against this world. The phrase "to go into the Church," which we are sometimes asked to regard as an invention of the seventeenth or eighteenth century, is in reality a mediæval idea expressed in mediæval language. So far as this idea can be said to have been displaced at all, the fact is certainly one of the results of the religious upheaval of the sixteenth century. To this extent, and no further, there is real truth in the statement which has often been made, that the Reformation was a layman's revolt for the recovery of the things which belong to him by right.

The consequence of this accentuated clericalism was that the clergy became an estate, with interests and instincts peculiar to themselves. They never actually degenerated into a caste, because of the prevailing law of celibacy, which, in part the expression of an exaggerated asceticism, expressed also a true instinct for its own day. But the gulf between clergy and laity, at all times and in every religion a possible danger, had now become a very grievous one, and the lay folk began to look elsewhere for help which should really supply their souls' needs. And this was not all. From being a sharply defined estate, the clergy came to be a kind of *imperium in imperio*, nominally subject to the laws which bound other men, but in practice claiming that they

were only bound "saving their order," and making this reservation cover a very large part of their lives. In truth, they were only "half the king's subjects." Although a working arrangement might be reached from time to time, the position was one of constant friction. As soon as the nation became conscious of its own unity, it became impossible. When Henry VIII. called attention to the incompatibility between Cranmer's oath to the Papacy, when he became Archbishop of Canterbury, and his duty as a subject, he had made no new discovery, but was only saying what all men had long known to be perfectly true. It might be met by a definite recognition on the part of the clergy of their position as subjects (leaving them still free, of course, to disobey for conscience' sake if need be, and to take the consequences), or the settlement might be veiled under a series of concordats and somewhat unreal "accommodations." But in one or other of these two ways the royal supremacy had to be vindicated, and vindicated it was, sooner or later, in every country of Western Christendom.

(*c*) A third side must be briefly noticed, the most important of all, upon which a reformation was already being prepared for. The mediæval system was one of ever-growing complexity and uniformity, and consequently one of increasingly mechanical character. Meanwhile, although some of the elements which underlay it were permanent, many features of the system were growing old, and were no longer suited to the requirements of a new age, which was striving to find an expression of its own. The strenuous and ever-renewed life which coursed along its channels was bound in time to burst its bonds and break away the limita-

tions of a system which had become too narrow for it. The same thing was the case with religious rites and customs. Men naturally endeavour to find an outward expression for the impulses of devotion, to enshrine their religious worship in acts of reverence. But herein lies a danger: the outward act remains after the reverent impulse which gave rise to it has become habitual or has passed away. A new impulse of reverence generally seeks to find for itself some new form of expression, not being content simply to re-vivify that which is there already. It is very jealous, however, of any attempt to remove the rites or ceremonies which it finds already in possession; and thus a continual process of accretion is going on, until the fringe of outward acts may only serve to hide that which it was intended to show forth, and to become an end in itself instead of a means to an end. Opinions may differ as to whether this point has been reached; but, granted that it has been reached, there can be no question that the only thing to be done is to clear away with a bold hand, in spite of the fact that the process is one of no little danger. There is the clearest evidence of a wide-spread feeling in the sixteenth century that this point had been reached. Again, as regards theology: the current theology of any particular age is in constant danger of becoming depraved by over-definition in some particular direction. And this result is almost inevitable when it is divorced in a measure from practical religion and treated as an abstract science. The great foundation truths get to be taken for granted and thus overlooked, whilst theological study tends to become a mere intellectual exercise upon points of detail. And thus, not only are the opinions of

theologians made to rank with the facts of the Christian creed, but the whole proportion of the faith is lost. The student of mediæval theology can hardly fail to see to how large an extent this had come to be the case. And now the inevitable reaction was at hand, in the shape of a return to first principles, and a reconstruction of theological systems from the primary facts upon which they were based. And once more, as regards the individual religious life. The fundamental question as to all religion is, which end does it start from? Is what I am doing for God the basis of everything, or what He is doing for me? In other words, are Works the primary fact, or is Grace? The one view is essentially pagan, the other is essentially Christian. But the difficulty is, that we are continually liable to slip back into a pagan doctrine of works, owing in part to the self-centredness which is at the root of our sin, in part to the fact that the grace of God must needs produce works in us, unless we have received it εἰς κένον. That this was a dominant tendency in the later Middle Ages is indisputable, in spite of many and most beautiful exceptions. Personal religion frequently degenerated into an endeavour to make an atonement for sins, and thus to appease an offended God. We can see signs of it in the multiplication of expiatory masses, in the undue stress which came to be laid upon the performance of external acts of penance, and in many other ways. It has even been said that religion had become an elaborate system of safeguards against the consequences of human sin. This, no doubt, is as true and as false as many other smart sayings ; but the fact remains that it is in part true. And perhaps there was hardly anything against

which the reaction of the sixteenth century was so keen. Certainly there were very many who had little or no sympathy with Luther's theory of justification by faith, at any rate in the form in which he stated it, who yet strove strenuously to vindicate again the Catholic doctrine of grace.

Now all these things, the huge pretensions of the papal monarchy, the withdrawal of the whole clerical body from the duties of ordinary citizenship, and the increasingly mechanical character which was coming over religion as a whole, affected other parts of Western Christendom not less than England. And the solvent forces which were gradually undermining the mediæval fabric are to be perceived as clearly on the continent as here. And yet the course of the movement was entirely different here from what it was there. On the continent the movement was either one of radical reconstruction, or else it degenerated into a mere sweeping away of practical abuses and a forging of the old chains yet closer. In England, on the other hand, it is clear that what was aimed at was not to make anything new but rather to protect and invigorate what was really old, and to cut away everything which obstructed its free growth. And whatever failures there may have been in the process, it is at least clear that this description fits the English Reformation better than any other could do. How then is the fact to be accounted for, that the course of the Reformation was so different here from what it was elsewhere? Why did not England go the way of Spain or of Germany? The answer is obvious. The Reformation in England no doubt largely depended upon the special circumstances of our history in the six-

teenth century ; but it was largely conditioned also by what the English Church and nation already was and had always been.

To speak first of our relations with the Papacy. Englishmen were quite accustomed to think of Britain as having a distinct position in Europe. The strip of sea was a barrier to an extent which we can hardly realise now, and to the inhabitant of the mainland the Englishman long continued a stranger, with a character which was at least full of individuality. English kings had proudly repudiated the idea that their realm was in any way bound to the Empire, and had claimed the proud title of Imperator or Basileus in witness of the fact. No English king but Richard the Lion-hearted had ever recognised that he held his crown from an Emperor; and he only did so in order to regain the freedom which would enable him to repudiate his bargain. Nor was this aloofness confined to civil concerns ; and bearing in mind the relations of Anselm with Dublin and St. Andrews, there is a real fitness in the salutation of the Archbishop of Canterbury by Pope Urban II. as *quasi alterius orbis papa*. Again, it must be borne in mind that there was no mediæval theory without its counter-theory ; and this was very definitely the case with the current theory as to the relation of the Papacy to the Church. Of the great schoolmen who set themselves against it in one way or another, three, Alexander of Hales, William of Ockham, and John Wyclif, were Englishmen. Although it would not be true to say that their view was in any sense that of English Churchmen as a whole, there are many signs that the other theory had begun to sit very lightly upon thoughtful men. No doubt, there were great Church-

men who magnified the Papacy on every occasion, and made use of language about it which modern Papists can read and quote with complacency ; but there are also others who did their utmost to check its constant encroachments, and to secure that English affairs should be settled in England. Once more, the English character of the sixteenth century did not greatly differ from that of the nineteenth. The temperament which thinks more of what is practically useful than of what is logically unassailable was as characteristic of us then as it is to-day. The Englishman cared little for the precise credentials of the system by which he was governed so long as it worked well ; on the other hand, a system which had been proved and found to work ill need look for little mercy at his hands. Consequently, resistance to Papal tyranny was no new thing to us : time after time English Churchmen and English statesmen had had recourse to it. In fact, it is no exaggeration to say that there had been a growing tendency to resist these encroachments for two centuries before the abolition of the papal jurisdiction. But at length, in the sixteenth century, there were new facts. The New Learning had shown us that, in Tonstal's words, "The Church of Rome had never of old such a monarchy as of late it hath usurped." Since therefore the papal monarchy was not of divine right, and since experience had shown that it was a nuisance, the practical Englishman wished nothing better than that it should be swept away, so far as he was concerned. Others who were less practical, or to whom the existence of a Papacy had become a kind of second nature, might do as they thought good ; but at least they claimed the right to exercise a corresponding discretion. In

doing this, however, he never dreamt of separating himself from the unity of the Church. The English theologians, Tonstal and Gardiner, Stokesley and Sampson, make this perfectly plain in their defence of the king's proceedings against attacks from without. All that we had done was to remove an innovation which had come to be a notable obstacle to that unity, so far as no small part of Christendom was concerned.

Turning now to the relations between Church and State, and the position of the clergy: here also the action which was ultimately taken in England had been led up to by previous events. The question was to us no new one; it had been raised again and again, now on this point, now on that. Conflicts of jurisdiction, divergences between the canon law and the law of the realm, questions of immunity, and disputes about taxation were of frequent occurrence: questions hardly spiritual at all in any real sense, although at the time they were contested as if the whole spiritual order stood or fell with them. Now there was no great difference between the claims of the civil power in England and elsewhere. But the course of the struggle in England was profoundly modified by the fact that the civil power was far stronger as a rule than elsewhere. In England, and here alone, there was a government and a civil administration of justice as wide-spread and as constant as that of the Church itself. This being so, a contest between Church and State, on matters which were not really vital to either, could have but one result. And in fact the contest always ended, sooner or later, in a victory for the Crown. It might be glossed over, the rights of the Church might be set forth in imposing

language, but the result was uniformly the same. In other words, in England the Royal Supremacy was from the first a reality and not a shadow. If there existed for a time an *imperium in imperio*, it only existed on sufferance; and little by little the civil power extended its sway.

At length, at the Reformation, the civil power called for a formal recognition of its authority, and laid hold upon that which it claimed with no light hand. Henceforward there was to be no *imperium in imperio*; henceforward there was to be no question of the fact that the King of England was king of all his people. But still, excepting for the temporary excesses of the period of transition, no new principle was introduced. If we compare the Reformation Settlement in this respect with the famous principles of William the Conqueror as recorded by Eadmer, there is little if anything that is new in principle. All that has happened is that what was once arbitrary and occasional has now been made regular and precise. Here again, the Reformation was but the completed work of forces which had been in operation long before.

And once more, with regard to the clearing away of what had become formal or out of proportion in faith and worship. Such a task appealed to some of the most deeply-rooted elements of the English character; and above all, it commended itself to Englishmen at a time when they were busily engaged in weighing the existing order and ascertaining for themselves how much of it was practically useful. The only danger was lest they should do their work oversweepingly, with too utilitarian an eye and with too little of real spiritual insight. But the process itself of

regulation and simplification was the carrying out of an aim which had long been before the English mind. It is hard to make a hero of Reginald Pecock, but he was a very far-seeing man, and often represents the best spirit of the English Church of his day as no other does. Never is this more convincingly the case than when he warns his fellow-bishops that it is not wise to make the way of salvation narrower by multiplying definitions and rules, and so to place additional difficulties and stumbling-blocks in the path of the wayfaring man. The warning is taken up by John Colet when he advises his scholar to keep to the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and let divines, if they will, dispute about the rest. It finds its most perfect expression in the words of Launcelot Andrewes, "God hath made plain those things that be necessary; those that are not plain, not necessary."

It is sometimes said that the English Church steered a middle course in the religious revolution of the sixteenth century. If this means that we deliberately made a compromise, nothing could be further from the truth. Men were not in the mood for compromise; rather they often fought about minor points of personal preference and individual opinion when they might very well have left them open. But on the other hand, if it means that the English Reformation aims at giving expression to the many-sidedness of God's revelation, it is doubtless most true. It is true in the sense that our Reformation was the work of the body as a whole and not of any particular section. And it is true in the sense that the English Church made a deliberate effort to assimilate what was

good, whencesoever it came. That our Reformation took such a course is due in part to the fact that many of the elements in it were familiar to us already; in part to the fact that the English Church already possessed the type which has been developed more strongly since.

Such a Reformation is no doubt open to attack from many quarters. For example, the Via Media may be the way of loftiest aspirations, but it may be no more than the line of least resistance. The practical man is frequently a bungler, and his handiwork does not always serve the purposes which it was intended to serve. The work in which a whole people is occupied will hardly be done without gathering round it the harpies and the vultures. And a change which was carried out in so business-like a fashion does not satisfy those who are accustomed to judge of spiritual fervour by excitement.

Much loss and failure there undoubtedly was. But it ought not to discourage us to find that the English Reformation can be so spoken against, and from so many contradictory points of view.

CHAPTER VII

THE REFORMATION[1]

By the Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF LONDON

All great movements which affect the organisation of society are of slow growth, and are complex in their nature. It is difficult always to keep this truth in mind. There is a tendency to investigate one cause to the exclusion of others. There is a tendency to regard only the immediate steps which produced a change, or criticise only the immediate results which that change produced. I propose to regard the Reformation in England under three aspects: political, moral, and intellectual; and to consider the larger and more permanent causes and results.

1. Politically the Reformation expressed the dissatisfaction of the national spirit with the Papal government of the Church. The Middle Ages tell a continuous tale of opposition to Papal interference. In England, earlier than in any other country, a national spirit was developed. The end of the thirteenth century saw England united under a truly national system of government. The Pope was not allowed to exercise any influence on English affairs. Clergy and laity alike saw with growing discontent the drain of English money to the Roman Court. So far as the Reformation declared that the affairs of the English Church should be managed

[1] A Paper read at the Church Congress, Carlisle, 1884. Reprinted by permission.

within the realm, it only expressed a long-prevailing sentiment of the English people.

2. Morally, the organisation of the mediæval Church had become unwieldy. Institutions once useful had survived the period of their usefulness. Monasticism fostered an indolent class. There were too many clergy, and many of them acted unworthily of their calling. Ecclesiastical discipline had become a vexatious means of exacting money. Ecclesiastical disputes were common, and appeals to Rome were encouraged. A process in the Papal court was costly and was endless. Diocesan and provincial jurisdictions were almost destroyed by the system of appeals. The encroachments of Rome had thrown into confusion the old machinery of the Church. Thoughtful men had long seen the dangers of this disorganisation, and the need of reform; but national or provincial Synods were powerless without the Pope. Even Europe, united into the reforming Councils of the fifteenth century, failed to discover a practicable scheme for reform. Nothing could be done save through the Papacy, and the Papacy became more and more secular in its aims, more and more immersed in Italian politics. Meanwhile the feeling of nationality grew apace. In England the rise of a prosperous middle class created a practical spirit which wished to see the Church made more useful to the people. The associations of the past ceased to outweigh the needs of the present. The clergy were bidden to feel that they were made for the people, not the people for them. The moral aspect of the Reformation was a desire for a simpler Church system, more intimately connected with the aspirations of national life.

3. Intellectually, the Reformation movement was helped by an increased knowledge of the world, of literature, and of the language of the Scriptures. Men were not satisfied with being told that doctrines or ceremonies were the traditions of the Church; they asked for the grounds of these traditions; they demanded proof of their agreement with the words of the Church's Divine Founder.

These three tendencies were each of them of long growth. No one of them necessarily involved the overthrow of the Papal headship, or any breach in the outward unity of the Church; but when they all came together, they created a mass of opposition to the existing system, which ended in a series of revolts.

The importance of Wyclif in religious history lies in the fact that in him these three tendencies first converged, and were embodied in his career. At first he was an ecclesiastical politician, who employed his learning in finding arguments for combating the Papal claims to interfere in the affairs of the English Church. Next, he laboured at the restoration of preaching and a revival of religious life. The more he increased in spiritual earnestness, the more he felt that the spiritual interests of men were sacrificed to an overgrown ecclesiastical system. He asserted that the Church was the congregation of faithful people, and that the Papal primacy ought to be exercised solely for the purpose of ministering to their needs. His noble translation of the Bible put into the hands of Englishmen the whole of Scripture; "Our great charter," he calls it, "written and given to us by God, on which alone we can found our claims to His kingdom." Then, in the interests, as

he thought, of theological learning, Wyclif went on to attack the current form in which the doctrine of the Sacrament of the Altar was expressed. He invoked "grammar, logic, natural science, and the sense of the Gospel," against a definition which stated that the words of the priest at consecration wrought a change in the actual substance of the bread and wine. He did not deny, nay, he condemned those who denied, the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Christ's body, he said, was sacramentally and spiritually, but still actually, present in every part of the Host, as the soul was present in the human body. Wyclif did not seek to overthrow the current belief in the nature of the Sacrament; he only demanded that the philosophical definition of its operation should be less material and more spiritual. He thought that the language in ordinary use was unscientific, and led to a low view of the Sacrament itself, and to an undue exaltation of the person of the priest.

Thus, politically, Wyclif asserted the freedom of England from Papal interference; morally, he strove to adapt the ecclesiastical system to the needs of the people; intellectually, he demanded that doctrines should be defined in accordance with "logic, natural science, and the sense of the Gospel." Wyclif strove to gain these ends within the existing framework of the Church; but this was not to be. The Papacy refused to move in the direction of reform till it was startled by the revolt of half of Western Christendom. It then became less powerful for political interference, in the countries which remained in its obedience. It reformed the more glaring abuses in its ecclesiastical system, and developed a strong organisation for defensive and

offensive purposes. Intellectually, it made little change in its traditions.

The question of the influence of the Reformation on England can only be answered by considering what England gained and lost by abandoning the Papal headship. This is only possible by comparing the chief features of the English Church, not with an idealised Church of the Middle Ages, but with the Roman Church as it has been in operation since the Council of Trent. I wish to be as impartial as inherent prejudice will allow an English Churchman to be. You will pardon me if my language sounds cold, as I briefly indicate a few considerations of the results of the three causes which I have traced.

1. Politically, the Reformation largely developed the national spirit of England, through the need of antagonism to the Papacy and the Pope's adherents. First, the war with Spain, which was a direct result of the Reformation, directed England into the career of colonisation, to which her present greatness is due. Next, the breach between England and her chief neighbours on the Continent produced a feeling of isolation, which forced Englishmen to think and act for themselves. The national spirit of England became more resolute, adventurous, and practical. Englishmen were driven to face actual facts, and deal with them promptly and sensibly. It was this training which enabled England to overcome her competitors for the mastery of the New World; but she would not have overcome them permanently unless she had also shown a greater civilising power, which means greater honesty, greater straightforwardness, greater love of justice. National morality, it must be remembered, can only be judged

by comparison. I cannot say that before the Reformation England's policy showed a greater care for righteousness than did that of her neighbours; but since the Reformation there have been many conspicuous instances in which England has shown a more exalted standard of national morality. England has gained by the Reformation in the more sterling qualities of national life. On the other hand, it must be admitted that Europe as a whole lost somewhat by the breach of its religious unity. Its aims became narrower, more self-interested, less concerned with matters of European policy. As regards England itself, increased strength of national character was won by a sacrifice of larger interests. The Reformation intensified England's tendency to isolation. It deepened, if it did not create, the less attractive features of the English character—a narrowness of sympathy, an inability to recognise problems which lie outside the sphere of immediate practice, and a disregard of logical principles of national action. This was in a great measure England's loss from the Reformation.

2. I turn to the ecclesiastical system of England as it was affected by the Reformation. First, as regards the mechanism for the self-government of the Church, the Reformation did not go far enough. The Papal headship was abolished, and the temporal privileges of that headship were transferred to the Crown. Nothing was done to re-establish the organisation of the Church as a self-governing community in spiritual matters. It must be noted that the loss of its old mechanism was the result of a long course of Papal aggression. The English Church inherited confusion, and the time of the Reformation was not propitious for amending that

confusion. The royal supremacy took the place of the Papal supremacy; but the Church as a spiritual community gained no greater liberty of action. As a consequence of this, the English Church has shown too great a tendency to Erastianism. Its discipline is defective; it lacks a logical or settled system of jurisdiction. This must be admitted; but again an impartial comparison with other countries suggests some compensation. The English Church has been in close relation with the national life. Its demands may not have been so precise as those of the Roman Church, but its pervading influence has been greater. It has had no exact theory of the relations between Church and State; but the exact theory of Rome has never been successful in practice. A theory may be very imposing; but when it is whittled away by separate concordats, which are being constantly eluded, it ceases to command much respect. The English Church may still repair its system in the future; but I doubt whether it has much to learn from the success of the system of the Church of Rome.

As regards the relations of the Church to the people, it must be admitted that the changes made at the time of the Reformation were too exclusively made in the interests of the prosperous middle class. The old services were adjusted to their intelligence, were made simpler and more practical. Moreover, the exigencies of a time of change demanded one intelligible and uniform mode of worship. Everything combined to make the new system narrower and smaller than the old one. It contained fewer elements which appealed to higher and lower minds; it aimed more exclusively at the average man; it had little outlying region of mysticism in which finer souls might

wander at will ; it did not enthral the unintelligent by appeals to their feelings ; it disregarded the teaching of the eye ; it aimed at practical edification, at an orderly, but comprehensive organisation of religious society. I pass by the question how far the Anglican Church did the utmost, or the best, that the times allowed. She certainly achieved one great object, which marks her as distinct from other deviations from the old system. She preserved intact the institution of the Church and of the Sacraments as they were in the Apostolic age. By so doing she retained the possibility of strong organic life. On the other hand, she lost some of the more imaginative elements of religious feeling ; adopted a form of worship which was simple, but somewhat inflexible ; and became too exclusively connected with the aspirations and desires of the active and influential classes in English society. Hence, in a time of spiritual awakening, she could find no room for John Wesley, and was so well satisfied with her own work of edification that she looked coldly on the work of evangelisation. In another time of spiritual awakening she lost the allegiance of many fine minds, which missed in her the definite assertion of the principles of ecclesiastical life.

Admitting these defects, let us again turn to comparison with the history of the Roman Church. The Church of England has not, at all events until recent times, produced the same number of individuals who have scaled the higher regions of the spiritual life. She has not in the past succeeded in laying so firm a hold upon the masses. But she has undoubtedly succeeded in carrying Christianity into the principles which direct the life and conduct of the community, in a larger degree than prevails in any other country. Her direct-

ness, her demand for a sense of individual responsibility, her full offer to all of the means of grace—these things have tended to keep strong in Englishmen that which is the chief element of the religious life, a sense of sin. The more elaborate system of the Roman Church has not been so successful in this point in those countries where it has worked unimpeded. This consideration seems to me to be a very weighty one ; for the sense of sin is the most powerful bulwark against the temptations of unbelief. On their capacity for quickening and keeping alive this sense of sin, the future of all religious organisations will more and more closely depend. The strength of the Church of England lies in the fact that she has created and maintained a high average of practical Christianity. The national difficulties which impressed upon her in the sixteenth century somewhat limited aims have now passed away. Made wise by experience, she has the promise of a great future. Without any change in her constitution she has made her system more definite, has found room for higher aspirations, has shown that she can influence the masses, has developed great missionary activity, and has spread her influence in every quarter of the globe. Only in later years has she begun to reap the full harvest of the Reformation.

3. Intellectually, I see no losses to be set against the gain of a frank acceptance of Holy Scripture as the sole basis of doctrine and Church government, and a recognition that the sense of the Gospel has to be determined by strict adherence to "logic, grammar, and natural science." The modest claim of the Anglican Church to be "a witness and keeper of Holy Writ" has been fully maintained. The greater pretension of

the Roman Church to inherent powers of authoritative interpretation has not proved so efficient a barrier against unbelief. An extensive frontier affords weak places for attack. The process of slow retreat from untenable positions is hard to accomplish. The imposing appearance of strength and organisation vanishes on closer inspection. English theology has shown a capacity for facing the actual questions which perplex men's minds. It has been strong in its readiness to accept the historic method, and in its desire to obtain scientific results ; it has done this in a careful and sober spirit, which has made it powerful to mediate between conflicting opinions. The English Church has been especially successful in retaining the allegiance and directing the thought of vigorous minds.

To sum up these fragmentary remarks. The teaching and the personality of Wyclif expressed and foreshadowed the great characteristics of the English Reformation. The influence of the Reformation in England was strong in directing our national history and moulding our national character. The reformed Church of England has kept alive the spirit of personal religion in a way which contrasts favourably with other religious organisations. Her defects have been serious, but they are not irremediable, and she has shown a capacity to remedy them. In the region of thought she has held the strongest position, for she has elected to stand by the strength of her great central fort, the power of the Scriptures as the Word of God, and the historical truth of the facts which they relate.

CHAPTER VIII

THE RISE OF DISSENT IN ENGLAND

By the Rev. J. HUNT, D.D.

WHY is not the National Church the Church of the nation? To this question there are many answers, according to the different readings of history. Unfortunately, the history of religious parties in England is rarely written with impartiality. Facts are sometimes ignored and often denied, so that, instead of history, we have merely the colouring or the party prejudices of the writers. They follow each other, tell the same stories without further inquiry, misrepresent the men whom they dislike, praise those with whom they agree, and end in a representation of history which is essentially false.

This essay is intended to be an historical inquiry. The writer wishes to keep close to undisputed facts, and to make only such inferences as he believes can undeniably be deduced from the facts. He wishes to write in a conciliatory spirit, not to provoke opposition, which, however, he scarcely hopes to avoid so long as there are any who to truth prefer their party or their prejudices.

The first and most direct answer to the question we have asked is to be found in the principles of a narrow Puritan party. It is difficult to speak on this subject with sufficient caution, because of the vague

and indefinite use of the word Puritan. A custom has of late arisen which speaks of Catholics and Puritans, or Anglicans and Puritans, as if all Puritans were one definite class, and distinct from the Church of England, while some who were not Puritans are regarded as constituting the Church. But all Puritans were Churchmen. They strove to avoid separation. Independents, Baptists, and all who separated from the Church, ought not to be classed with Puritans. As a matter of history, the name has been applied to all who embraced the doctrinal system of Calvin. Bishop Montague called the framers of the Lambeth Articles Puritans; and according to Bishop Sanderson, Richard Hooker himself, as a doctrinal Calvinist, was called a Puritan. The name was also used as a general term for all persons who were more than usually serious, who had morning and evening worship in their families, and were more strict than others in their religious duties. King James I. reckoned all as Puritans who did not approve of his arbitrary government. Richard Baxter said that in his time a Puritan was one that was for archbishops, bishops, liturgies, and ceremonies, as he had always been.

When we speak of a narrow Puritan party, we mean those represented by Thomas Cartwright—those who believe that in the New Testament there is a complete system of ecclesiastical polity, that Christ established a Church with authority to confer Orders, without which no man had a right to preach or to administer Sacraments, and that this Church polity was not episcopal, but presbyterial. The minutest points of government and ritual were supposed to have been determined by Christ, as they had been by Moses in

the old dispensation. The argument was that if care was taken for the ornaments of the Temple, much more for those of the Christian Church. If the bars, pins, and besoms of the Tabernacle were of Divine appointment, it was not likely that the government and the ritual of the Christian Church would be left undetermined. The elder Leighton to the same effect said, that if God remembered the bars of the ark, it was not likely that He should forget the pillars of the Church. Even the genius of Milton, led away by the exigencies of an argument, failed to realise that the Christian Church had more of the spirit and less of the letter than the older dispensation. He, too, thought that if God cared so much for the inferior building, much more for the more glorious structure.

Those who speak of Puritans as if they were not Churchmen suppose a Catholic or Anglo-Catholic party. There was, indeed, at one time such a party. It was represented by Gardiner, Tonstal, Bonner, and others, who held all the Roman Catholic doctrines taught in the Church of England before the Reformation, with the exception that they acknowledged the supremacy of the King in the place of the supremacy of the Pope. But to this they returned in the days of Queen Mary, and when Elizabeth came to the throne they refused the oath of royal supremacy. They were strictly and properly Roman Catholics. In the time of Elizabeth there was no such party as is now called the Catholic or High Church party. Those who were not Roman Catholics were definitely on the side of the Protestant Reformation. Most of them had been in exile, and were the friends, and to some extent the disciples, of the Swiss Reformers. The majority of them would not have

objected to the establishment of a Presbyterian polity and Presbyterian ritual. But it was the will of Queen Elizabeth that the hierarchy or a hierarchy be continued. Her policy was to make outward changes as few as possible. Such men as Jewel, Grindal, Sandys, Pilkington, Parkhurst, and others, who afterwards became bishops, were indifferent as to what polity was established. Parkhurst, when Bishop of Norwich, said in plain words, that he wished the Church of England had been modelled after the pattern of the Church of Zurich. There were many things enforced by the Queen which they did not like, but they reckoned that to conform was the wisest thing they could do. Sandys, who at one time strongly objected to the ceremonies, recommended that they should be laid aside gradually and quietly. A beautiful house, he said, was not to be pulled down and levelled to the ground because there was "a window awry or some little eyesore." Some of the same bishops were afterwards strict in enforcing the ceremonies, because they were ordered by royal authority. The whole of the bishops and leading clergy in Elizabeth's time were Calvinists, strong Protestants, in a sense Puritans. The real division was into Erastians and Anti-Erastians. Those who conformed and enforced conformity did so because they believed the habits and ceremonies were indifferent in themselves, but the royal or state authority should be obeyed. Those who scrupled conformity did so because they believed that the things imposed were not indifferent, that they had a meaning, and that the Queen or Parliament had no right to enforce them.

If the Reformation in any way affected the constitution of the Church of England besides the introduc-

tion of Protestant doctrines, it was in establishing the supremacy of the civil ruler as supreme head of the Church. The Act of King Henry's time conferred on him the power to redress, reform, &c., all such errors, heresies, &c., whereby any manner of spiritual authority or jurisdiction, &c. The same power was restored to Elizabeth. The Church which had authority in controversies of faith was the Church of which she was the governor. Convocation has had no actual authority since the Act of Submission. The argument which underlies the whole of Hooker's Polity,[1] which is fully set forth in the eighth Book, is the supremacy of the civil ruler over the Church. Hooker even defended the title given to Henry of "Supreme Head of the Church," on the ground that the civil ruler had the same authority in the Christian Church which the Jewish kings had in the State Church of the Jews. He did not defend the divine right of episcopacy as opposed to what Cartwright maintained of the divine right of presbytery. He defended the authority of the king or queen to rule the Church. The first writer in the Church of England after the Reformation who advocated the divine institution of episcopacy was Bancroft, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury. In a famous sermon, preached at St. Paul's Cross in 1588, he took the ground for episcopacy which Cartwright[2] had taken for presbytery, but far above the

[1] Burnet says that this Act was understood by the old learning as no interference with ecclesiastical matters, but by the new learning that in such matters the magistrate had full authority ("History of Reformation," P. iii., B. iii.). As a matter of fact, it took away all power from Convocation.

[2] So much is said in the sermon of the supremacy of the civil magistrate over the Church that Hallam says Bancroft did not advocate the *jus divinum* of Episcopacy, but only stated the fact of its existence, and that "in no strong terms" ("Constitutional History," vol. i., p. 396, n.). He quotes Cardwell

ecclesiastical authority he put the civil. He reproached those represented by Cartwright as being the only party of Christians in the world that had framed an ecclesiastical polity in which the civil ruler was not supreme. It was on the same principle that the Elizabethan bishops enforced the habits and the ceremonies. Archbishop Parker said that he cared nothing for surplice, cope, tippet, or wafer bread, but he did care for the authority that enjoined them.[1] Bishop Aylmer told his recalcitrant clergy that they were the Queen's servants; the surplice was the queen's livery, and they must wear it.

The principles of this narrow party of Puritans were an entire innovation on the principles of the English Reformation. They believed that they found an ecclesiastical polity in the Scriptures, and therefore they refused to acknowledge the supremacy of the Queen in matters which concerned the Church. The controversy evoked by Cartwright turned on this question. Whitgift, who answered Cartwright before Hooker did, found no Church polity in the New Testament, and maintained that the civil ruler should be supreme in the government of the Church. These principles accorded with the facts of the Reformation, which had been effected mainly by the sovereign and Parliament. Henry compelled the clergy to submission; Edward and his advisers took the side of the Reforming bishops, who were the minority in his reign; and Elizabeth suspended all who refused to acknowledge her supremacy and embrace the reformed faith.

as saying the contrary, which has certainly been the general belief. The sermon is said to have been evoked by the Mar-Prelate Tracts, which were written not by a Puritan, but by a Separatist, if John Penry was, as is supposed, the author.

[1] Quoted in Hook's "Parker."

It is common now with some party historians to follow Peter Heylyn and the Nonjuror Brett, in ascribing the scruples of the Puritans to the influence of Calvin. Heylyn even credits him with having cajoled the English bishops not to enforce the ceremonies. The great Reformer of Geneva is not at the present time in high favour, but he was certainly not responsible for the scruples of the Nonconforming Puritans. Calvin was a man of peace, a great reconciler. He was willing to sacrifice much for unity. He wished to unite all the Protestant Churches into one great Reformed Church, and he looked to the Church of England as the natural and proper leader in such an enterprise. Heylyn has a story of Cranmer's refusing Calvin's help, giving as a reason that "he knew the man," but like many of Peter's stories it does not rest on any authority. Cranmer always called Calvin his "dear brother in Christ." Great deference was always paid by our Reformers to Calvin's judgment. The first Prayer Book of Edward is believed to have been revised at his suggestion, and changes introduced which he recommended. The sentences, exhortation, confession, and in a sense the absolution, as they now stand in our Prayer Book, were in substance taken from Calvin's. He thought the revised book still contained *tolerabiles ineptiæ*, trifles that might be endured, but he urged conformity on all the Puritans. When the troubles at Frankfort were ended he rejoiced, though the victory was on the side of those who had contended for the use of the English Prayer Book. He regretted that the Queen enforced the ceremonies, but it was due to him, to Bucer, and to Peter Martyr, that many of the Puritans did not make an actual

separation. These all advised conformity as the wisest thing to be done in the circumstances. Beza gave the same advice to a congregation of Baptists at Banstead in Surrey. They were to continue to frequent their Parish Churches. When some Puritans succeeded in forming a presbytery or *classis*, it was to be in subjection to the existing government of the Church. The *classis* was not to ordain but to recommend to the bishops proper persons for ordination.

On the principle that opposites generate each other this narrow party produced another. Peter Heylyn calls the Puritans a "faction," and so they were if they are all to be identified with Cartwright, but this cannot be done. Heylyn's party was also a "faction," and of later origin. It, too, was an innovation on the principles of the Reformed Church of England. The old Episcopal régime of the Church had been retained by the will of Elizabeth, but it was not regarded as of divine institution or essentially necessary to the constitution of a Church. The orders of foreign and non-Episcopal Churches were recognised by Act of Parliament.[1] Men like Travers at the Temple, and Whittingham, Dean of Durham, who had been ordained by presbyters, were licensed and instituted by the bishops. The Huguenots were openly protected and their Orders acknowledged, and there are cases of Scotch Presbyterians preaching in the Church of England. The narrow party among the Puritans had taken very high ground in the assertion of the divine right of Presbytery. The new party was to rival them in the same claim for Episcopal government.

[1] 13 Eliz. c. 12, "An Act for the Ministers of the Church to be of Sound Religion." It is quoted at length in Marsden's "Early Puritans," p. 227.

By the time of Archbishop Laud this new faction had become so strong that it was able in great measure to revolutionise the Church. The communion tables, which took the place of the altars ejected at the Reformation, and which were to stand, as the rubric still directs, in the body of the church or chancel, were removed to the place where the altars formerly stood, and placed altar-wise by the east wall, and people were told to bow to them as Roman Catholics bow to the altars. We do not know if in Laud's time the clergyman turned with the tables, and, contrary to the rubric, stood on the west side instead of the north.

This party not only made changes in the worship and ritual of the Church, they even succeeded to some extent in changing the doctrine. Hitherto the clergy accepted the theology of Calvin. All the Reformers, so far as their sentiments are known, were Calvinists. As the doctrinal system of Calvin is now all but universally abandoned, the question is merely one of antiquarian interest. We may examine it with the same impartiality that we would a petrified fossil. But the Calvinism of the Standards of the Church of England is a fact which no one who has not party interests to serve would ever have thought of denying. The arguments of such writers as Archbishop Lawrence are not worth a moment's consideration. His main argument on that side is that our Articles were taken from the Augsburg Confession, which was compiled by Melanchthon, and he was not a Predestinarian. It is true that some of our Articles are taken from this Confession, but it is also true that this Confession has no Article on Predestination, and our Reformers thought proper to compile one. Lawrence has another argument, which is, that the sub-

ject was not yet under discussion when our Articles were written ; but Calvin's Institutes were first published in 1534, and that was a famous book with all the Reformers. The contrary doctrine was first preached at Cambridge, and struck with astonishment the old orthodox Churchmen as much as they had been struck by the doctrine of the *jus divinum* of Episcopacy. It was at once denounced as a dangerous novelty. The heads of the Church—Canterbury, York, and London—immediately met and asserted in the strong language of the Lambeth Articles the doctrines which were embodied in the Standards of the Church. The chief Anglican theologians in the time of Elizabeth and James were Calvinists. Not merely Hooker and Whitgift, but some of the ablest defenders of Episcopal government. Hall, Carleton, and Davenant were sent to the Synod of Dort to support the Calvinists of Holland. Some sneer at this as merely an eccentricity of the Scottish king, but it was in accordance with the prevailing belief of the Church at that time. James said of Bertius, a Dutch Arminian, that he was so shameless as to identify his doctrine with that of the Church of England. By the time of Charles I. the change was very marked. Not many years had passed since the Synod of Dort, when some one asking what the Arminians held, was answered, that they held all the best bishoprics and deaneries in the kingdom.[1]

It is not easy, nor is it necessary for our purpose,

[1] The Church of England not only adopted Calvin's doctrine of Predestination, but also his doctrine of the Eucharist. We often hear of "the bare meal" and "the nude commemoration" of the Calvinists, but Calvin expressly repudiated the view of the sacrament commonly ascribed to Zwingli. He calls the Lord's Supper a spiritual banquet, a feast on Christ's sacrifice, a real participation of Christ, not a simple figure, but the verity joined with the symbol. If any one were to compare what Calvin wrote on the Sacraments

to trace all the influences at work from the Long Parliament to the time of the Restoration of Charles II. The Civil War has been called the bishops' war, but this is scarcely correct, for many of the bishops, as Williams, Hall, Ussher, and others, had opposed the faction which had revolutionised the Church. They had, indeed, to share the misfortunes of Laud's party, but this was owing to their political action. They did not wish to oppose the king. The time of the Commonwealth has been called the reign of the Puritans, and the hardships which some of the clergy had to bear are ascribed to Puritan persecution. But those here called Puritans were entirely different from Cartwright's party in the time of Queen Elizabeth. The members of the Long Parliament were regular members of the Church of England, and in nowise opposed to Episcopal government in the Church. The Westminster Assembly of Divines, if we exclude the Scotch contingent brought by political necessity, were almost to a man of the general rank and file of the English clergy, who had received regular Episcopal ordination, and were satisfied with the constitution of the Church as it stood in the time of Queen Elizabeth. It is only in a conventional sense that they are called Presbyterians. Some of the chief of them, as, for instance, Herbert Palmer, had received promotion at the hands of Archbishop Laud. They agreed to a Presbyterian government as the best thing they could do in their circumstances. That they were Calvinists in doctrine shows what a strong hold the doctrines of Calvin still had on a great body of the

with the fifth Book of Hooker, the conclusion will be irresistible that Hooker had Calvin before him when he wrote. There is not only the same doctrine, but often the same language and illustrations. Calvin's doctrine is not to be confounded with Cartwright's, which Hooker refutes.

English clergy. They were now the party in power, and it is contrary to all that we know of parties in triumph if those on the other side do not suffer.

During the Commonwealth were heard the voices of two men, afterwards bishops, who well deserved to be heard. These were Jeremy Taylor and Edward Stillingfleet. They were at that time on the losing side, and were more alive to the evils of intolerance than they might have been in their hour of prosperity. Taylor advocates the liberty of prophesying[1] on the broadest principles, and with resources of ecclesiastical learning such as have been rarely equalled. He called it terrible folly to expect all men to be of one mind. There was room in heaven for men of different opinions, and so there ought to be on earth. Unity may be desirable, but charity is even better than unity. The Apostles' Creed is the summary of the Christian faith, but it is not even necessary to believe this to be a Christian. It is enough to confess that Jesus is the Christ. There is no heresy where there is a good life. The party which called itself the Catholic Church assumed the office of judge of heresy, and then went on adding new articles to the Christian faith. But those who judge are as likely to be in error as those who are judged. Protestants who take the Bible as their standard ought to be tolerant of those who differ from them, because of the uncertainty of the meaning of many things in the Bible. Every religion ought to be tolerated except it can be shown to be injurious to the State. God will not be angry with a man because he is in error if he has done his best to find the truth, and we should not be less tolerant than God is.

[1] Published in 1647.

Edward Stillingfleet[1] wished to see the whole nation united in one Broad National Church. His argument, like Hooker's, was addressed to those who believed in the divine institution of the Presbyterian government. These must have been very few, for many of the leaders of them, who at this time were called Presbyterians, agreed with Hooker and Stillingfleet that there was no definite ecclesiastical polity in the New Testament. Stillingfleet said that the old Catholic Church was broad, embracing different parties and admitting different doctrines and ceremonies. A Church is a society for public worship, and all its outward forms should be arranged according to what is convenient. At first a Church was probably a society with a pastor or deacon, but when a Church became co-extensive with a nation, a different form was not merely lawful but necessary. The Jewish Church was constituted after the fashion of the civil polity, and if Jesus is to be over His house as Moses was over that of the Jews, then the Christian Church should receive its polity from the State.

At the Restoration of Charles there was a golden opportunity for strengthening the National Church on its true basis, as here expounded by Stillingfleet, with the liberty of prophesying which had been advocated by Jeremy Taylor. But Stillingfleet at the Restoration was too young to have any influence with those in authority, and Taylor was away in Ireland. The party called Presbyterians told the king that they wished to see a wide National Church. Very few of them objected to Episcopacy in itself. Notwithstanding the sneer of Jeffries, "Baxter for bishops!" it is true that,

[1] The "Irenicum" was published in 1659.

though against what is understood by a hierarchy or prelacy, they wished an Episcopacy in which the bishops would act with the presbyters. They also wished the creation of suffragan bishops, as some of the dioceses were too large for one man to govern.

The King issued a warrant for a conference on the Prayer-Book, in which both parties were to meet, consult, and determine on the changes to be made. When they met, the Puritans were not treated as equals, but as the vanquished or disinherited. The Bishop of London said that they had asked the Conference, and now they must say what they wanted. This was clever policy, worthy of a statesman like Sheldon, but when the question was the peace and unity of the Church, something else was wanted than clever policy. The Puritans asked some things which were desirable and would have been beneficial to the Church, but they also asked many things which were trifling and unimportant. They would have been satisfied with much less than they asked, but they were at the mercy of men more disposed for retaliation than for unity. The Prayer-Book was in some matters made more objectionable than it was before. The great opportunity was lost. The blame is generally considered to have rested with Sheldon. "This," Coleridge once wrote, "was the incendiary; this Sheldon, the most virulent enemy and poisoner of the English Church. She still feels the taint in her very bones." Perhaps this is too strong, but Dissent may now be said to have really begun. Those called Puritans had been hitherto members of the Church of England, unwilling to separate. Now they are called Nonconformists, and are in separation. The ejected ministers

had popular preaching power, and their adherents among the laity represented a very large proportion of the wealth and industry of the nation. Bishop Burnet says that for many years after the Restoration the Churches were but thinly attended. It was not till towards the end of the century that they began to fill. The Nonconformists had decreased by a third or a fourth, yet some years later Lord Barrington could say that they were still a fourth part of the population and were "men of substance and of great influence in the nation."

Not many years had passed before some on both sides began to devise schemes of accommodation or comprehension. The King had proved as unreliable to the victorious party as he had been faithless to the vanquished. Now both found that they were brothers born for adversity. The primary difficulty with the Nonconformists was re-ordination. Even the most liberal of them had an idea that there was something mystical or mysterious about ordination. Art. XXV. of the XXXIX. seems to suggest that Orders, Confirmation, and Extreme Unction were merely "a corrupt following of the Apostles." There is, indeed, the other alternative that they are states of life allowed in Scripture, which does not seem a description applicable to any of them. The Puritans, that is some of them, thought it sacrilege to take a second ordination, but common-sense Churchmen, like Bishop Wilkins, explained that re-ordination simply meant compliance with the present law. Orders implied order. To leave some ceremonies open was a common Puritan request, and one which might wisely have been granted. Some which were called "nocent" would in time have been

found to be in-"nocent." Another reasonable request was that they might use the Prayer-Book without giving "assent and consent" to all and everything contained therein. This is now virtually granted.

Richard Baxter once said that "if all the Episcopalians had been like Archbishop Ussher, all the Presbyterians like Stephen Marshall, and all the Independents like Jeremiah Burroughs, the breaches of the Church could soon have been healed." But this spirit was not that which prevailed. There were other men who would yield nothing. Many books were written against toleration, and compulsion was declared to be the sure way to make "good Catholics." St. Augustine was quoted, who had testified that the Donatists flourished so long as they were tolerated by Constantine, but they were soon extinct after Honorius made laws for their suppression. Herbert Thorndike saw no other remedy for Nonconformity but to compel all to embrace the Catholic faith as set forth in the first six General Councils. This was the duty of those in authority. To comprehend Presbyterians was to put them on equality with the Catholic Church. Samuel Parker, afterwards Bishop of Oxford, said that the pretence of conscience was the greatest of all disturbers of government, and that Christianity itself would be annihilated if the State did not use its authority to suppress the sects. As the State was so remiss in its duty, another writer proposed the restoration to Convocation of its ecclesiastical authority, for that was the proper body to distinguish between heresy and the Catholic faith. That it should be again assembled, the writer said, was absolutely necessary, for there were even pleas current for "universal unlimited toleration."

Now we come to a new development in our Church history. James II. became a Roman Catholic. William of Orange, a Presbyterian, came in his place. There was no more trust to be put in princes. Hitherto, to use Stillingfleet's comparison, Church and king, like Hippocrates' twins, laughed and wept together. But now the new faction had taken the ground of the old Cartwright faction, that the Church should rule itself, and be independent of all secular authority. The Lower House of Convocation asserted this principle by some acts of lawless disobedience. It refused to obey the royal mandate, and claimed a right to meet when and where it liked, independently of the Upper House or any higher authority. The Lower House pursued its course of rebellion till George I. found it necessary to put it to silence as a disturbing element both in Church and State.

The great comprehension scheme of 1689 missed its way. Tillotson had recommended that it should be referred to Convocation. A High Churchman was chosen prolocutor, and its fate was soon sealed. With one party there was great rejoicing; South expressed his delight that the "rabble" had been excluded and the "thief" not allowed an easy entrance, but the ejected party still showed its unwillingness to be entirely separated from the National Church. After the Act of Uniformity they had made an agreement to continue to receive the sacrament at their Parish Churches. Though not conforming in all things they wished to be regarded as members of the Established Church. This they showed by occasional conformity; but it raised opposition from some of both parties. The famous De Foe was the chief objector on the Non-

conformist side. As a political Dissenter, it appeared to him as merely a mode of evading the Test Act. His argument was the easy one, that if attending church was right going to chapel was wrong, and contrariwise if going to chapel was right going to church was wrong. To dissent and yet occasionally to conform was to deny the lawfulness of Dissent. Howe, as an occasional Conformist, answered De Foe. He argued that the Church of England was not essentially defective; its defects were only the accidentals. It was, therefore, the duty of Nonconformists to conform as far as they could with a good conscience. De Foe's alternative of God or Baal was not regarded as serious, but only as a play of wit. Though a Nonconformist by circumstances he had never tried to persuade any one to Nonconformity. To this De Foe answered, that when a man has become so indifferent to the interests of Dissent, it is his duty to conform at once and entirely.

In 1703 a bill was brought into Parliament to prohibit occasional conformity. Moderate men on both sides regarded this as an infringement of the rights of Nonconformists. On one side it was defended by such men as Sacheverell, who wished to see Dissenters effectually excluded from all civil offices. The interests of the State required the suppression of all Dissent. The object of occasional conformity was said to be the undermining of the Church. Leslie, the Nonjuror, supported Sacheverell, and to use his elegant language, stripped the "wolves" of their shepherd's clothing. He rejoiced to find that the spirit of intolerance had its counterpart in the Scotch Presbyterian Church, which had just petitioned Parliament

that in any bill for toleration the benefits of it might not be extended to the Episcopal Church in Scotland. Other Nonconformists besides Howe defended occasional conformity. They pleaded that they were unwilling Dissenters, and had always been opposed to separation. One of the chief of them was Lord Barrington, father of the famous Bishop of Durham. He called it an injury and a hardship if Nonconformists were not allowed to communicate at their Parish Churches. Bishop Burnet opposed the bill as inconsistent with the principles and practice of the Church of England since the Reformation. In the time of Queen Elizabeth Roman Catholics held civil offices, and practised occasional conformity until they were forbidden by the Pope. Both Burnet and De Foe said that the tendency of occasional conformity was to reconcile Dissenters to the Church, while the denial of it tended to confirm them in their Nonconformity.

The result which many foresaw came in its time. The Nonconformists gradually conformed. Only a small remnant was left, which became Arian and ultimately Unitarian. In the third decade of the eighteenth century many are known to have conformed. Among them were Joseph Butler and his friend Thomas Secker ; Isaac Madox, who died Bishop of Worcester ; and Josiah Hort, who became Archbishop of Tuam. It may be difficult to trace the *causal nexus*, but as a matter of fact the decay of the Dissenting interest became a subject of lamentation among Nonconformists. With the accession of the House of Hanover the spirit of toleration had increased. The Stuarts were gone, and with them the Sheldons, the Thorndikes, the Sacheverells, the Souths, and the Leslies. The Lower

House of Convocation had paid the penalty of its intolerance. It last effort was to censure Bishop Hoadly, that great but much abused prelate, whose whole life was a continuous battle for the toleration of all sects and parties. He lived to a great age, and saw the complete triumph of the principles for which he contended. His biographer's words are, "He was so happy as to live long enough to reap the full reward of his labours, to see his Christian and moderate opinions prevail over the Kingdom in Church and State, to see the Nonconformists at a low ebb for want of the opposition and persecution they were too much accustomed to expect from both, many of them ministers desiring to receive re-ordination from his hands, to see the general temper of the clergy entirely changed, the bishops preferring few or none of intolerant principles, and the clergy claiming no inherent authority but what is the natural result of their own good behaviour as individuals in the discharge of their duty." Nonconformity had fallen almost to zero. Some of the ministers said that they were starved into conformity, but it was not dead, and it had a new life in the future. The Presbyterians may be said to have ceased to exist. The Independents and Baptists had always been separated, and were not, properly speaking, Puritans. It seems correct to say that they had the new life from the Evangelical or Methodist revival, which was a movement within the Church, though it produced communities which are practically Dissenters. The Wesleyan community, which is the largest Protestant Church in the world, the Anglican not excepted, are Nonconformists as it were by accident. They never made any formal separation, and if they have ever

shown hostility it has been in the way of retaliation for having been treated as schismatics.

The Church of England is still the National Church. The nationality is the basis of its unity. The enemies of the Church's nationality are the two factions of which we have spoken, who, each in its own way, have maintained that there is in the New Testament a definite ecclesiastical polity, and therefore the Church should not be subject to any secular authority. Toleration and comprehension are still our ideals. Let us unite as a nation for national worship, and tolerate each other as far as toleration is possible or practical. But let us look honestly at facts. The Church of England at the Reformation was stamped as a Protestant Church. By a licence of speech it may be called Catholic, but it is not Catholic in the sense in which Catholic is the antithesis of Protestant. At the Reformation it separated from the Papal Church, and accepted the same doctrines as were taught by the continental Reformers. It has become a custom with some party-writers to speak of the foreign Reformers as having instituted new Churches while we reformed the old. This is made on the assumption that Episcopacy is an essential of a Church, but this distinction was never made by any of the Reformers either in England or on the continent. They all professed to reform the old Church. Luther, Hooker says, formed no new Church.[1] The Church of England is the same that was established by Augustine, not in virtue of a successive hierarchy but in virtue of a successive people. It had its origin from the Church of Rome. It shared for centuries the errors

[1] As if we were of opinion that Luther invented a new Church! No.—B. iii., s. 1.

of the Church of Rome, but these were cast off when it took its stand as a separate National Church. Through all its changes it was still the Church of the Nation.

The recent decision of the Pope concerning the invalidity of Anglican Orders is one of the most fortunate things that could have happened to the Church of England in its present stage. It has been what the Germans call an *Aufklärung*, a clearing up of the whole business. It accords with the indelible Protestant character which was stamped on the Church of England at the Reformation. The Reformed Ordinal did not contemplate making a priest in the Roman Catholic or Jewish sense of a priest. In the revisions of the Liturgy everything that seemed to have such a meaning was carefully eliminated. The mere fact of the removal of the old altars, and the excision of even the word "altar" from the Prayer-Book, is sufficient evidence of that, and but for the ambiguity of the word priest it too would have been excluded. The Archbishops justly retorted on the Pope a *Tu quoque*, by showing that the primitive Ordinals had not the words which the Pope said were necessary to make a sacrificing priest, which by the Pope's argument proves that his own Orders are not valid, and that the very idea of a sacrificing priest is an innovation in the Christian Church. The power of working the miracle which the priest professes to perform by the consecration of the bread and wine, is denied to the English clergy in virtue of the denial of transubstantiation in our Articles and the substitution of the doctrine of a spiritual presence only to the worthy receiver.

The Pope took one clear strong point, and that one

was sufficient for his purpose, but there were many other considerations. On what is called the Catholic ground, that in virtue of the hierarchy we continue one with the Church Catholic, our Reformers certainly violated the canons which were made for the preservation of unity. A canon of the Council of Nicæa requires for the appointment of a bishop the sanction of all the bishops of the province, but the bishops in possession of the sees did not approve of a Protestant Consecration. When Elizabeth came to the throne they were suspended, not by ecclesiastical but by lay authority—all except Kitchen of Llandaff, a man of doubtful character, who turned with every wind. One of the most notorious falsifications of history is that the Church of England was reformed by the bishops and Convocations. It is a simple historical fact that the first Convocation in Elizabeth's reign, that of 1559, passed a series of resolutions strongly in favour of Roman Catholic doctrines and against the Reformed. Elizabeth had to wait for the sanction of Convocation till she got a Protestant Convocation willing to do as she wished. She issued a mandamus to four of the bishops to consecrate an archbishop. They refused. She then very properly did just what the head of a National Church ought to have done. She found some Protestant bishops who had been deprived under Mary who were willing to consecrate, and by her regal power she undertook to make good whatever was defective. On Catholic principles there was a defect which she could not make good. These bishops had no ecclesiastical jurisdiction ; they were not bishops in office. The sees to which some of them were nominated were not vacant, and on Catholic principles there cannot be two

bishops in one see. This subject was exhaustively discussed in the time of the Nonjurors. They said that the deprived bishops were still the bishops of their sees, and those who took their places were merely intruders. No civil power can deprive a bishop. Elizabethan bishops might confer such orders as were necessary for a Protestant Church, but they could not be valid according to Catholic law as it was interpreted by the Nonjurors. There were other objections to the consecration of Parker. Barlow, who was *the* consecrator, did not believe in the necessity of consecration. He said, as Cranmer had done, that election by the king or the people was enough without any consecration; so that if intention was necessary, he had no intention to make any such consecration as would now be considered Catholic by either Roman or Anglican. Miles Coverdale is known to have been a decided Puritan, and appeared at the consecration in his Geneva gown, as did also John Hodgkins. Moreover, Coverdale was not a bishop on Catholic principles. He had been intruded into the See of Exeter while John Voysey the lawful bishop still lived, who was restored in Queen Mary's time. Protestants may be perfectly satisfied with Parker's consecration, but Anti-Protestants can scarcely be satisfied with Orders through a succession in which there is so much uncertainty, and where the secular has governed the ecclesiastical.

The Pope by his decision had declared that the English Church can only be re-united with Rome by an unreserved submission. It would have been to the Papal interest to have acknowledged Anglican Orders. We might, like the Maronites in the East, have been allowed our own Liturgy and our own ceremonies, and we might

gradually have drawn nearer and nearer to the Pope in all things, just as occasional conformity among Nonconformists tended to entire conformity. Again, we may be thankful for the Pope's decision, for now we know that we can never effect union with Rome by merely doing as Rome does. Our experience in past times of the Pope's interference is not such as to make us long for it again. It is better that we keep our ground as an independent National Church. Those in England who adhere to the Pope have now their full rights as citizens. We do not wish to see them make progress, but this need not hinder the exercise of charity which is the bond of all virtues. They have declared by following the rites of a foreign Church, and by submission to a foreign bishop, that in religion they are not Englishmen but foreigners.

The corporate reunion of Protestant Dissenters has not the same impossibility as with the Church of Rome, but the difficulties are not to be ignored. Their absorption into the National Church seems from our point of view as desirable. But members of Dissenting communities are not of our opinion. Some see advantages in the very fact of separation, and some even see evil in the connection of the Church with the State, regarding the secular as in itself unholy. Their Church organisations are the means of the defence and propagation of principles which are to them of great importance, and in some cases they are agencies for reaching classes which have not been reached by the National Church. Some of these communities were begun with sacrifices, and are kept together by self-denial. They may have originated from forefathers whose memories are revered for their unwavering adherence to principles

which are still deemed sacred. They may have been centres of religious life when the lamp burned but dimly in the National Church, and they may be so again. That they will at once give up their present position as separate communities is not to be expected; but the clergy might often show a better spirit towards them. As a rule, the average Dissenter is a more tolerant man than the average Churchman. The Churchman's idea of a Nonconformist is generally taken from Nonconformist newspapers, where the predominant spirit is that of political or militant Nonconformity. This is like taking the idea of Churchmen from party Church newspapers where they appear in the least amiable light.

There are occasions in which the clergy and Nonconformist ministers might work together, but they are not many. Here we are met by a difficulty the same in kind as that of asking them to break up their present Church organisations. By the parochial system, which is a necessary part of the National Church idea, the clergyman of a parish is bound to do the best he can for his parish and for every parishioner. But Dissent is a discordant element. This, it may be said, is a disadvantage to the Nonconformist, and so an argument against the principle of a National Church. To this objection Dr. Chalmers rightly answered, that the question is not one of justice between Church and Church, sect and sect, but one of justice to the whole population. It is the misfortune of the present Nonconformists that, having been so long excluded from the universities, they have failed to reach a high standard of education. A Dissenting minister is not necessarily an educated man, while a clergyman of the Established Church is generally one who has had the highest ad-

vantages of public school and university training. This has resulted in what may be called a class distinction. The old Nonconformists strove hard to give their ministers a high class education, but the Nonconformity which has sprung up under Methodist influence has been more indifferent. A change, however, is gradually going on. Many of the clergy can now boast no more than the meagre training of a clerical college. On the other hand, now that the universities are open, the Nonconformists begin to have a higher education. It is yet to be seen if, with this higher education, they will remain Nonconformists. There does not appear to be any abstract reason why they should not, and so it may come to pass that a Nonconformist minister in a parish may be a Senior Wrangler at Cambridge or a double-first at Oxford, while his brother, the rector or vicar, may rejoice in nothing higher than a pass degree. We may lament our divisions, and show the healing spirit though we may not have the healing power. At the moment in the last century when there was the greatest likelihood of reunion, Dr. Doddridge proposed that the conforming and nonconforming clergy should occasionally preach for each other. This met the approbation of Archbishop Herring, but there are old Canons made under other circumstances by which this is illegal. It might perhaps be well to deal with some of these Canons on the principle which has been adopted in other cases, that of *Solvitur Ambulando.*

We have tried to state the facts concerning the National Church. It is by its very constitution a broad Church, and it is better that it should embrace parties which differ than not exist at all. But it must also be

tolerant to those that are without. Comprehension may not at present be practical, but the clergy should show such a spirit of charity as at least will not produce further alienation. Hostility has been provoked by the conduct of many Churchmen. The Wesleyan community is not likely to forget such an act as that of an amiable bishop who refused to allow "Rev." to be prefixed to the name of a departed minister in an epitaph in a country churchyard. The body of Nonconformists are not likely to forget the attitude once assumed by the National Society under the influence of such men as Denison and Manning, when it opposed the conscience clause, and even proposed to exclude from the benefits of secular education all children not baptized in the Established Church. Intolerance is hard to tolerate, and it is to be hoped that these things will be regarded merely as the eccentricities of individuals for which the Church is not responsible. It is gratifying to contemplate the good spirit which at the present time generally prevails among all Churches and sects towards each other. The Greek as well as the Latin Church repudiates the Anglican claims to such Orders as make a sacrificing priest, but the friendly intercourse which has lately appeared between the Russian Church and the English ought to be welcomed and encouraged. It is pleasant also to see that the Pope of Rome, though he does not admit the Anglican claims to Catholicism, is no more "the Man of Sin" and the great "Antichrist," but the "Venerable Brother" of Canterbury and York.

CHAPTER IX

THE ORIGINS OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT

By the EDITOR

THE precise origin of Church government is an obscure question, complicated not only by the general scantiness of our information on the Apostolic Age and that which followed it, but by the special difficulty that things must have been in a fluid and transitional state. One disturbing influence was the indefinite authority held in reserve by Apostles, another the waning ministry of gifts, which for some time crossed the growing ministry of office. Nor is it altogether an advantage that the question is a battlefield of controversy. If partisan zeal has done good service in collecting evidence, it has also done much harm—never more than in our own time—by its persistent appeal to other motives than the love of truth. Fortunately we need not go into the whole question. If Church government is as much ordained of God as secular, the powers that be of every lawful Church must have in any case as much divine sanction as the Empire under Nero. But is any particular form of Church government in itself unlawful? Whatever be the sin of its founders, is a later generation living quietly under it living in sin? Is Episcopacy, for example, or Presbyterianism so ordained of God that a Church otherwise governed is in a state of disobedience?

Now we are all agreed that there is a distinction between means and ends, and that in some cases God has made some particular means necessary for a particular end. If therefore Church government is a means and not an end, this does not hinder but that some particular form of it may have been ordained of God as necessary, or at any rate as conducive to the end. Whether this be the fact is plainly a different question, which it would be rash to decide by *a priori* considerations of doctrine or philosophy or personal inclination. The general tone of Scripture may give us a presumption, perhaps a strong presumption, one way or the other; but we are simply begging the question if we allow mere presumptions, however strong, to overrule clear historical facts. It may be true that we start with "presuppositions," as they are too politely called; but I hope we are not all of us too contemptuous of truth to alter them if truth requires it. These however are truisms, albeit two-edged truths as well, and the only reason for reciting them is the loud complaint of late in certain quarters that Bishop Lightfoot (of all men) was fool enough to overlook them. However, if any particular form of Church government is ordained of God as the only lawful one, there must be historical proof of the fact, and there can be no other proof of it. If no direct command of Christ or His Apostles can be shown like that which enjoins the Lord's Supper, it will suffice to show that the historical facts cannot reasonably be explained without assuming that such a command was given. The proof may be indirect; but it must be historical, and purely historical.

Let us first make sure of our terms. When the bishop first appears in history, he holds his office for

life, standing singly at the head of his presbyters, and governing the congregations of a single city. Country bishops governing villages cannot be more than a secondary growth of the office, for the Gospel spread from city to city, and more slowly to the country districts. So far as I am aware, there is no early instance of a bishop not holding his office for life. Even translations were a novelty in the third century, and were forbidden by the Nicene Council. Neither do we meet with two bishops governing one Church, for Narcissus of Jerusalem, at the age of 116, is hardly a real exception either to this or to the life-long tenure; or with two bishops governing distinct Churches in one city, unless Hippolytus at Portus be an exception; or with a bishop governing several cities at once. Thus the city bishop as just defined will be the earliest type of the bishop. It is not till Teutonic times that we find bishops of tribes, like the Goths or the Kentishmen, and the modern territorial bishop is a much later development. Of course the city bishop, the country bishop, the tribal bishop, and the territorial bishop are equally legitimate forms of the office; but the early Church was necessarily governed by city bishops, because the ancient world was as definitely constituted by cities as the modern world is constituted by territorial states. The bishop might have a country district attached to his city; but a bishop of several cities was as unthinkable as the King of Europe is now.

Let us next set down some undisputed facts. Whether the so-called bishops mentioned in the New Testament held definite offices or not, it is now agreed on all hands that their functions are ministerial, and not what we should call episcopal. They are doers of

work, not overseers. Their relation to the presbyters is obscure ; but the single fact that there were several of them at Ephesus and Philippi is enough to distinguish them broadly from the bishop of the next age. It is therefore all but universally admitted that there is no trace whatever of the bishop (unless it be James at Jerusalem) before, say, St. Paul's arrival at Rome : and it is equally admitted that every city has its one bishop at the end of the second century. Here then is a great change. How is it to be accounted for ?

The short answer is that the Apostles must have left command that every Church was to have its bishop. There is a good deal to be said for this theory. It explains a whole series of the facts before us, like the early spread of Episcopacy in Asia and elsewhere, and the insistance of Ignatius. It gives us an additional reason for the importance attached to the lists or succession of bishops by Hegesippus and Irenæus. Above all, it explains why later ages so firmly believed in a divine sanction for Episcopacy. So utterly have they forgotten the earlier state of things that they read Episcopacy without hesitation into the New Testament, calling James Bishop of Jerusalem, Timothy of Ephesus, and so on. Even Irenæus turns the bishops *or* presbyters of Ephesus (Acts xx. 17, 28) into the bishops *and* presbyters of Ephesus *and* the neighbouring Churches. Taking these facts together, they are summarily decisive that Episcopacy dates back to Apostolic times, and is at any rate not contrary to any Apostolic ordinance that was meant to be permanent. Whatever the Apostles did, they never gave command that the Churches were *not* to be ruled by bishops.

The theory is tempting : but it is not yet proved.

It explains some of the facts, and would be a poor theory if it did not: but we must go further to make sure that it is needed to explain them, and that it is consistent with other facts. Now if the Apostles really commanded that every Church was to have its bishop, this must be a historical fact capable of historical proof from the New Testament or later writings. We therefore begin with the New Testament. Can we trace in it (under no matter what names) a class of permanent local officers, each ruling singly the presbyters of his own city? These will be bishops in our sense of the word.

The first instance commonly given is James the Lord's brother, who was no doubt the chief man at Jerusalem after the removal of the other "pillars." His strictness of life and near relation to the Lord (a more important matter to Easterns than to us) must in any case have given him enormous influence. But influence is one thing, office is another; and an influence sufficiently accounted for as personal does not compel us to assume that he held a great office, though as a matter of fact he is called an Apostle, and ranked with the chiefest of the Apostles. The story that he was Bishop of Jerusalem was old in the time of Eusebius, for it dates back to the Clementine romances; but there is no sign that Eusebius knew more than we do of the matter, for we cannot take seriously the episcopal chair which was shown as that of James. Perhaps there is a touch of truth in the romances, when James is given a Papal rather than an Episcopal position at Jerusalem, for even in the New Testament he is rather a centre of all the Churches than a local bishop.

The case of Timothy and Titus is a stronger one,

for their work of appointing and governing elders is plainly that of a bishop. But this is work which must be done in every Church ; and if it is done by a single man, he still needs a permanent tenure and local connexion to make him a bishop. Now Timothy and Titus have no permanent office, and Titus moreover is not connected with any particular city. They are not bishops, but vicars apostolic, sent in the apostle's place on special missions at Ephesus and in Crete. The letters by which we know them are letters of recall (2 Tim. iv. 9, Tit. iii. 12), and there is no serious evidence that they ever saw Ephesus and Crete again.

Then come the "angels" of the seven churches of Asia. It would be rash to take these for literal bishops, contrary to the general symbolic character of the Apocalypse and to the particular argument that "the wor[illegible]ezebel" at Thyatira cannot well be taken liter[illegible]r. Moreover, these angels are identified with their Churches for good and evil, and made responsible for them to an extent which would be quite unjust to any literal bishop. As regards the "rulers" mentioned (Heb. xiii. 7, 17), it is commonly agreed that the Epistle is written to a definite Church ; and if so, its plural rulers cannot be a single bishop. There remains the "ministry" of Archippus (Col. iv. 17), and this gives no reason for making him Bishop of Colossæ or Laodicea, rather than, for instance, an evangelist or presbyter. We do not know what it was, though the allusion indicates, if anything, a subordinate office.

These appear to be the only instances by which serious persons have endeavoured to prove the existence of the bishop from the New Testament, and the proof seems in each case a failure. But if the necessity

of Episcopal government cannot be proved by Scripture, we are bound, on the principles of the Church of England, to deny that it belongs to the essence of a lawful Church, however legitimate and useful it may be. However, there is still the possibility that, though this necessity is not declared in the New Testament, surviving Apostles may have laid it down a few years later. This would have been a binding command for that age, and for our own it would be, to say the least, a recommendation of the most weighty character, which a Church will disregard at its peril.

There are few cases (if any) where the Apostles can be proved, otherwise than by Scripture, to have issued a particular command. However, there is no reason why this should not prove an exception. If, then, Apostles commanded every Church to have its bishop, either we shall find a bishop in every Church, or else (if fair occasion arise) we shall get a plain hint that the disobedient Churches are doing wrong. Now it is as certain as any historical fact can well be, that there was no bishop in the important Church of Corinth when Clement wrote. The purport of his letter is that certain presbyters have been turned out of office without good cause—the question of all others on which the bishop must have had an important word to say. It is begging the question to answer that the see must have been vacant, gratuitous and impossible to distinguish the "rulers" (plural, by the way) from the presbyters, or to assume that Corinth was ruled by some wandering prophet, or even to suggest that an episcopal Church need not have a resident bishop, as was the case with Virginia in 1775. All these explanations are shattered on one simple fact. From beginning to end

of a long letter, Clement never gives us the faintest hint that the presbyters at Corinth either had, or ought to have had, over them any human authority whatsoever. They are responsible to Christian opinion, but not to any official superiors. Again, though we need not doubt that Polycarp was bishop of Smyrna, there seems to have been no bishop at Philippi when he wrote. A monarchical bishop can hardly lie hid among the bishops and deacons greeted by him. It is just possible that St. Paul's greeting is copied without regard to facts, but I should be sorry to think that Polycarp "had far too much respect for the bishop" to send him so much as a civil message. Corinth and Philippi were important Churches, and are therefore flagrant cases of disobedience, if disobedience it was; and to them we may add the Churches contemplated in the so-called Teaching of the Apostles. The work is good evidence for some Churches of the sub-apostolic age, unless it be rejected as a romance of the fourth century—which at present seems an excess of scepticism.

We now come to Ignatius. Lightfoot has left little room for doubt that the seven Greek letters are genuine, and that he wrote them on his way to death in Trajan's reign. If we date them roughly in 110, they will fall about a dozen years after the death of St. John; and as Ignatius was then an elderly man, his youth must be well within the Apostolic Age. His conversion was probably not in early life, but, in any case, he must have known the truth of the matter perfectly well. His evidence, if we can get it, ought to be decisive; and so, indeed, it is. Episcopacy has already got a footing in Syria, in Asia, and probably elsewhere. He names the bishops of Ephesus, Magnesia, and Tralles, calls Poly-

carp a bishop, and mentions a bishop at Philadelphia. He calls himself a bishop from Syria, and speaks of bishops near Antioch, and says that the bishops at the ends of the earth are in the counsels of Jesus Christ. These are most likely monarchical bishops, and however exaggerated the phrase may be, it at least seems to prove that Ignatius knew of such bishops outside Asia and Syria. But this is only a small part of his evidence. He has the firmest possible conviction that Episcopacy is according to God's will, and this conviction he puts in the strongest language. "Obey the bishop" is his recurring theme. To put a few of his sentences together: "We ought to regard the bishop as the Lord Himself. It is good to know God and the bishop. He that honoureth the bishop is honoured of God. It is not lawful to baptize or to hold a love feast without the bishop. The Spirit preached, saying, Do nothing without the bishop"; and much more to the same effect.

If a reasonable time be allowed for this spread of Episcopacy, its beginnings in Asia must fall within the lifetime of St. John; and his opinion of it must have been well known. Indeed there is some reason to suppose that Tertullian may be right in tracing back bishops to St. John, and that the Apostle may himself have constituted some bishops, like Polybius and Polycarp at Tralles and Smyrna. Ignatius could not have used or found acceptance for his daring language without some sort of Apostolic sanction. Yet all his urgency falls very far short of proof that an Apostle commanded every Church to have its bishop. In the first place, Ignatius is attacking separatists, not presbyterians; individuals who disobeyed an existing order, not Churches which deliberately preferred another order.

With all his earnestness, he says nothing of Episcopacy different in kind from what the Apostles say of the Empire, "Honour the emperor: the powers that be are ordained of God." Yet few of us will hold that republican countries are living in sin. As the Apostles commanded obedience to the emperor as the *de facto* ruler of the world, so Ignatius with still more emphasis preaches obedience to the bishop as the *de facto* ruler of the Church to which he writes. But this is not all. He says, Obey the bishop, and that with all the urgency he can. His earnestness in the matter has not been exaggerated. All the more significant is the absence of the one decisive argument which would have made everything else superfluous. He never says, Obey the bishop as the Lord ordained, or as the Apostles gave command.[1] Must not this be the first argument in the mind of every one who believes it to be true? Could such a one, especially a man like Ignatius, have suppressed it all through six letters full of urgent exhortations on the matter? The silence of so earnest an advocate seems a plain confession that he knew of no such command: and the ignorance of one who must have known the truth of the matter seems decisive that no such command was given.

[1] The only passage which needs discussion is *Trall* 7 ἀχώριστοι [Θεοῦ] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου καὶ τῶν διαταγμάτων τῶν ἀποστόλων, where Lightfoot says, "the reference is doubtless to the institution of Episcopacy." Very well; but in what sense precisely? It does not assert that the Apostles instituted Episcopacy as a binding ordinance on all Churches. For (1) if Ignatius alluded at all to so decisive a fact, he cannot have failed to mention it frequently. (2) The διατάγματα (plural, be it noted) need not be taken more narrowly than the παραδόσεις of 2 Thess. ii. 15 and 1 Cor. xi. 2: and New Testament usage will not allow us to say that the compound word necessarily implies a general command. (3) If Apostles appointed Polybius bishop of Tralles, as they very likely did, the fact would be alluded to in τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, and the διατάγματα would be injunctions to obey him, &c., rather than general commands that other Churches should have bishops.

We have seen in a former chapter that the Apostolic Age was not without hints which may have helped the transition to Episcopacy. If James was not actually Bishop of Jerusalem, the example of a Church practically guided by a single man was conspicuous, and may have been suggestive. Occasionally some old disciple, one perhaps who had seen the Lord, would settle down in the midst of a younger generation, and might wield an enormous influence. Again, Timothy holds for the moment the powers of a Bishop of Ephesus; and he is not likely to have been the only special commissioner of the sort. If some of the others were left stranded by the Apostle's death, they might decide to remain indefinitely at their posts; and in this case they would be (monarchical) bishops at once. As the Apostle had entrusted Churches to them, another generation would say with practical truth, though not with precise accuracy, that Apostles had made them bishops of their Churches. Even this is more than we need to account for the origin of such a tradition. Imagine that St. John made Polycarp only one of the (plural) bishops at Smyrna, and that he did not become the (monarchical) Bishop of Smyrna till after the Apostle's death. It would be a very pardonable confusion of dates if the next writer told us roundly that St. John made him Bishop of Smyrna. This would be verbally true, though not strictly accurate. I give this merely as an illustration of what might happen in other cases, for when Irenæus tells us that his own teacher was made Bishop of Smyrna by Apostles, he is not likely to be mistaken.

We need not assume any Apostolic command to explain the rapid spread of Episcopacy. Given that

there was no Apostolic command the other way, the fact is as easily accounted for as the spread of despotism over Europe at the end of the Middle Ages. The Churches must have felt a heavy strain as the last of the Apostles were passing away. The Neronian persecution, the fall of Jerusalem, and the rise of heresies had seemed to usher in the last days, yet the Lord delayed His coming. Meanwhile strong measures were urgently needed to brace up the loose government which remained when the two great Apostles had been cut off. Corinth was one conspicuous object-lesson of disorder, and most likely there were plenty more; and even if Clement's Christian tact availed for the moment, the Church could not long escape the task of working out its own enduring peace. But when the forces of anarchy rise high men always turn to monarchy for help, and the bishop was visibly the strongest centre of unity the Churches could have, at a time when they needed all the strength they could get. A Papacy, for instance, would have been very much weaker. It may well be that the last word of St. John from Ephesus was precisely that encouragement which alone was needed to make the drift to Episcopacy irresistible.

The change was easy, for the bishop was no successor of the Apostle. The two offices are utterly different. The Apostle is a witness to the world, who preaches from city to city, founding and confirming Churches, but never treating any particular city as more than a convenient centre for the work in hand. The bishop is the resident head of a local Church, whose proper business is just the administration with which the Apostle meddles but seldom and unwillingly. In the main, the one office is preaching the Word, the

other serving tables. Things are fairly clear if the one monarchical bishop was developed from the plural bishops of the Apostolic Age. In this case the name would remain, and few who are not students of history know how easily even great changes are overlooked, if only names are kept unchanged. Indeed, the great difficulty in studying history is that meanings change so much faster than words. If so, there is nothing surprising in the naïve way in which most of the early teachers are called bishops by writers of the third or fourth century, who may sometimes have known rather less of the facts than we do.

The right conclusion would seem to be that Episcopacy is like monarchy, an ancient and godly form of government, which we may be well content to live under and loyally to serve. Divine sanction it has, and of the clearest, but we have found no trace of any such exclusive divine authority as would make other forms of government sinful. It is often, indeed, maintained that when a custom has once obtained prevalence in the Churches, it becomes as binding on all future ages as if the Lord Himself had so declared it. But as such prevalence may fairly be claimed for some customs plainly repugnant to God's written Word, like the worship of images in the fifteenth century, such prevalence is of itself no proof whatever of divine authority. The Lord called Himself Truth, not Custom, as the arch-reformer Gregory VII. reminds us. Truly the voice of God is in the silent adoration of the ages bending low before the cross of Love. Through all the sins and ignorances of men the Spirit of God is working hitherto. Christ promised to be with us all the days, and that promise He will most surely keep and perform; but He never pro-

mised to tie God's truth to any decisions of sinners, however unanimous they may be. Circumstances may change our duty with regard to any custom that is not ordained of God, and of circumstances every Church must necessarily judge for itself in each generation. If the Scots, for example, have done rashly in abolishing bishops, then so much the worse for them; but we cannot say that they have disobeyed Christ. Granted that our own clergy are as truly called of God as if St. Paul's own hands were laid on them, what more can we want? Whitgift and Hooker took a strong position when they limited themselves to the proof that Episcopacy is a lawful and ancient institution; the Caroline divines only weakened it by attempting to turn the tables on Puritans who insisted that a Church governed by bishops is no Church at all.

But if we deny that Episcopacy has any exclusive divine authority, some of the weaker brethren will ask whether we are not giving up all certainty in religion. Not at all. Christ is none the less our Saviour, and His Holy Spirit none the less our guide, if we use His gift of reason on a command He never gave. It is bad logic, not to say unbelief, which refuses to be sure of our own place inside Christ's Church if we cannot lock our neighbour out of it. But some consequences do follow our denial. If bishops are not essential to the being of a lawful Church, neither is any particular mode of appointing or consecrating them, provided all things are done decently and in order. If even the outlines of Church government are not positive laws of God, much less are the details of public worship. There is a strong presumption (though not the argument they took it for) in the scoff of the Puritans, that the Holy Ghost had

remembered the basons, and forgotten the archbishops. The particular ceremonial of the Lord's Supper, for instance, is not more likely to have been directly ordained of Christ than an order of bishops ; and there is no historical evidence that it was. Christ's Church is no fortress of Zion with guarded gates and battlemented walls, for Jerusalem shall be inhabited as towns without walls, and the Lord Himself shall be a wall of fire around her. It is a flock, not a fold ; and its unity is not in a Catholic uniformity of doctrine, discipline, and ritual, but in the living faith which alone has power to touch the ever-living Shepherd. This the Church of England has not forgotten. "In these our doings we condemn no other nations, nor prescribe anything but for our own people only. For we think it convenient that every country should use such ceremonies as they shall think best to the setting forth of God's honour and glory, and to the reducing of the people to a most perfect and godly living, without error or superstition ; and that they should put away other things, which from time to time they perceive to be most abused, as in men's ordinances it often chanceth diversely in divers countries." So says the National Church of England, and so the National Churches which make up Eastern Christendom must say too. Rome is the dissenter.

We do not believe as we are taunted, that God remembers the ends and forgets the means, or that the things He leaves to men's discretion are uncared for by Him. We are not the men who cut God's world in sunder with a sharp distinction of sacred and profane. It is all holy. Christ ordained but two sacraments ; yet the men who invented others were not entirely

wrong, if the thought of their heart was a dim idea that every experience of life has a sacramental virtue of its own, if only we have faith to make it ours. All things end in mystery, as the schoolmen said; and on the deepest mystery of all, the guidance of our life by the Spirit of Truth, we can safely rest in reverent and loving thankfulness.

CHAPTER X

HISTORY OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

By the Rev. Canon MEYRICK, M.A.

On the day before He suffered, the Lord Jesus Christ sent two of His disciples, Peter and John, from Bethany to Jerusalem, to make the necessary preparations for the Paschal feast. The preparations consisted in the purchase of a lamb, some bitter herbs of the nature of endive, a mixture of vinegar, dates and other dried fruits, forming a sop, some unleavened bread, and sufficient wine to fill four cups or bowls when mixed with water. The bread, the wine, the sop, and the bitter herbs they probably sent immediately to the guest-chamber designated to them by the Lord; the lamb they led to the temple and killed it before the altar in the court, some of its blood being caught by a priest and solemnly thrown at the base of the altar. Then having taken out and burnt on the altar the inward fat, they dressed the lamb to be ready for cooking, and transfixing it with a pomegranate spit, carried it to their lodging and roasted it in an oven.

At a later period in the day the Master, with the remaining ten Apostles, entered Jerusalem and took His way to the house where He was to eat the Passover. When the hour for the banquet on the sacrificed lamb arrived, He and His twelve companions disposed themselves round the board in a reclining position. He

then took one of the cups, known as the first cup, in His hands, and having given thanks over it, gave it to His disciples, saying, "Take this and divide it among yourselves" (Luke xxii. 17). This was the cup of the Old Testament, as distinct from one that was to follow. When they had drunk of it, they dipped their hands in water, and to add the lesson of humility to that of purity, the Lord also washed His disciples' feet. Next, each took in turn with their fingers from the dish a mouthful of the bitter herbs (which reminded them of the oppression suffered by their fathers in Egypt), and the second cup was filled. Then, after an exposition of the historical bearing of the sacrificed lamb, the bitter herbs, and the unleavened bread, Psalms cxiii. and cxiv. were sung, the second cup was drunk, and the lamb was eaten. The feast was now drawing towards its close when the Master, taking a piece of the bread in His hands, blessed, brake, and gave it to the disciples; and just as He had probably said a little before over the dish containing the lamb, "This is the body of the lamb that was sacrificed by our fathers in Egypt," so now He said of the bread, "This is My Body, that is being given for you." As the solemn eating of the lamb had hitherto commemorated the Israelites' deliverance in Egypt, effected by the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb, so henceforth the solemn eating of the bread was to commemorate the greater deliverance effected by the sacrifice of Himself, the antitype of the Lamb. Next came the drinking of the third cup, which in like manner the Lord transformed and elevated into being a commemoration of His blood-shedding on the cross. The final address to the disciples and the intercessory prayer (John xiv.–xvii.) followed; the fourth cup

was drunk; Psalms cxv.–cxviii. were sung; and the Paschal supper was over, while from the dead wood of the old form, whose meaning was now exhausted, there had blossomed forth a new institution which was to last until He came again.

Twice the Master had commanded His disciples to "do this," that is, to eat the bread and drink the cup, in memory of Him, when He should have passed away from the earth. Primitive Christian piety was not content to confine the injunction to one part of the feast that was being celebrated. The Apostles and their disciples felt themselves bound to re-enact the whole of the feast, and they kept it on the evening of every Lord's Day, with such changes as circumstances had made necessary. Those changes were considerable. The Paschal Lamb could no longer be eaten, for it was a type now fulfilled by the antitype; the bitter herbs could not belong to a feast which, since the resurrection of the Lord and His ascension, had become a commemoration of joy and gladness; bread could no longer be used unleavened, for that was peculiar to the Paschal week, and represented an event no longer to be commemorated. Instead of these things, ordinary food was provided by those who were capable of offering it, and shared by all alike; while towards the end of the meal, in the same place that it had occupied in the Lord's Last Supper, a loaf and a cup of mixed wine, selected from the offerings, was placed before the president, was solemnly set apart by prayer as the Body and Blood of the Lord, and was distributed to all present, who, no doubt, stood for the ceremony. Then followed exhortation, prayer, and singing of Psalms after the model of the original feast.

Two hundred years later, Tertullian says, that when the eating was over, they sometimes chanted the Psalms of David, sometimes sang original hymns, and that prayer concluded the feast. "We go away," he adds, "as men who have not so much supped as been to a school of philosophy" (Apol. xxxix.).

Such an institution as this, a joyous commemoration of the Master spiritually and invisibly present to their affections, was altogether in accordance with the character of Christ's religion, who described Himself as coming not as an ascetic like John the Baptist, but (in contrast with him) eating and drinking; and it accorded with the practice of the Apostles, who not only on the particular occasions of the public meal, but every day in their own homes, "ate their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God" (Acts ii. 46).

So much was the Lord's Supper, both in its social and devotional aspect, a part of the early Church system, that St. Paul instituted it as a matter of course in the Churches which he founded, and when it was abused did not therefore countermand it, but ordered the correction of the abuses.

To us it might seem the most natural thing possible that St. Paul should have prevented the recurrence of the profanities of which the Corinthian converts had been guilty (in not discerning or distinguishing the Memorial food from the other elements of the meal), by enjoining a separation of the sacred and the common parts of the feast. But this, we see, he did not do, and it probably would have shocked the Apostles who had been present at the Last Supper, and all the Christians of the first century, to have proposed to do so. It was not any theological reason, nor any sense of the practical

evils indicated by St. Paul (and seemingly almost inseparable from the ordinance when enthusiasm had died), that at length caused the transference of the Eucharist to the forenoon from the evening, and the consequent separation of the sacred and the social feast. It was the stern pressure of Imperial Roman Law.

At the beginning of the second century the Emperor Trajan entertained a rooted apprehension and dislike of all societies and clubs, and absolutely forbade their holding their meetings in the evening, when he believed that conspiracies would be hatched by them against the State. The various prefects, therefore, issued prohibitory edicts against evening meetings in the years 110 and 111. The prohibitions imposed by these edicts covered the case of the Lord's Supper, understanding by that name the feast consisting both of the Agape, or love feast, as it was called, and of the Eucharist proper, the two not being yet separated (Ignatius *Ep. ad Smyrn.* viii., Ed. Lightfoot). What was the Church to do? She transferred the Lord's Supper to the forenoon, making at the same time a change in the order of proceeding. Whereas hitherto the memorial part had been nearly at the end of the feast in accordance with the order of the Last Supper, it was now made to precede the meal, which thus came at a time more suitable for refreshment than the earlier morning would have been. It was probably the practice of the second century, not of the first, which St. Chrysostom describes as follows: "After the sermon, and prayers, and the communion, when the congregation broke up, all the faithful did not return immediately to their homes; but the rich and well-to-do, bringing food and eatables from their

own homes, invited the poor, and made a common table, a common meal, a common party in the Church itself; and thus, from eating together, and from reverential regard for the place, they were all closely united in Christian love" (*Hom. in Dict. Pauli, Oportet esse hæreses*).

This order did not last long. Before the end of the century, probably in the reign of Commodus, when the severe vigilance of the Emperors was relaxed, the Agape or social meeting was re-transferred to the evening, whilst the Holy Communion proper remained as part of the forenoon service, or occasionally even of the ante-lucan service (Tertull. *De Corona*, iii.). The likeness to the original Lord's Supper was diminished by the change effected at the beginning of the second century, and still more by this further change towards the end of the same century, when indeed to outward appearance it was almost destroyed. The Communion was now preceded by the "Missa Catechumenorum," consisting of psalms, hymns, lessons from the Old and New Testaments, sermon, prayers for the catechumens, for the possessed, and for penitents; then came the Communion service proper, or "Missa fidelium" (so-called from all but the faithful who were about to become communicants having been now dismissed), which was composed of a litany, an offertory, the consecration prayer and the reception in both kinds, followed by further prayers, hymns, and thanksgivings, and concluded by the bishop's blessing.

Up to this period the Eucharistic thanksgiving offered by the officiating minister had scarcely taken a fixed form, but whether extempore or not, it consisted of a giving of thanks for two things, first, for the supply of the necessary wants of man, secondly, for the

benefits received through the death and passion of Christ, solemnly commemorated in the Bread and Wine, which at once represented the Creator's gifts to His creatures, and were the tokens of the Body and Blood of Christ. When the Holy Communion and the Agape were finally separated, the thanksgiving for temporal food was confined to the Agape, and the character of a mystical commemoration of the sacrifice of the death of Christ was more notably stamped on the offering of the Bread and Wine, now standing apart from its previous environment. In the "teaching of the Apostles," A.D. 100, in Justin Martyr, A.D. 150, in Irenæus, A.D. 180, we find a joyous recognition of the sovereignty of God and His goodness in giving sustenance to man, *together with* an offering of praise and thanksgiving for the redemption wrought by Christ. Now the idea of temporal sustenance drops away, and from the time of Cyprian, A.D. 250, the more solemn character of the rite, as commemorating the sacrifice of the Lord, is dwelt on with great and greater emphasis and exclusiveness.

Then in the fifth and sixth centuries came an event which had an untold influence on the doctrine and on the constitution of the Church. This was the breaking-up of the Roman Empire and the irruption of the barbarians. The Roman troops drew back, and left territories which they had occupied in the possession of the Northern invaders; the Church did not equally recoil. To its infinite credit, it exerted every nerve to gather within its fold the heathen conquerors. The strain was enormous, and the Church had to condone a vast amount of ignorance and superstition, which it hoped afterwards to remove and correct, satisfied for the time if only it could gather the new nations within

the net. The barbarians found that the Church to which they had submitted celebrated, with great pomp, a pomp once unknown, a service, not now making part of a social meal in which the Last Supper of the Founder had been commemorated and re-enacted, but standing by itself and apart from its old surroundings, in which the priest appeared to declare that the bread which he held in his hand, and the wine which he poured forth, were the Body and Blood of the Lord. The new converts were for the most part simple, rude soldiers of the peasant class, not acquainted with Hebrew parable and poetry, but familiar with the magical rites of their own superstitions. They accepted the words that they heard in their baldest signification. Their teachers knew that they were materialising the traditional faith in respect to the Sacrament, but they had to leave the rude conception uncorrected for the present, considering that the immediate work to be done was to secure a profession of Christianity, and that if they did that, all would come right in the end.

Thus, the materialistic view of the bread and wine becoming the Body and Blood of Christ took its place in the Church, and when once it was rooted in the apprehensions of the vulgar, the more enlightened members of the body were not able, as they had expected, to eradicate it. It continued, however, to be only the view of the uneducated populace, and it was not till the ninth century that any one was found to put it into words and advocate it in a serious treatise. This was done by Paschasius Radbert, a monk of Corbey, probably himself sprung from the people. His doctrine was at once controverted by men more learned than himself, who had been trained in the traditional doc-

trine of the Church, Amalarius, Archdeacon of Trèves, Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mentz, John Scotus Erigena, Walafrid Strabo, and Bertram, or Ratramnus. But argument could not overthrow a now widespread, if ignorant, belief, which based itself when assailed upon the apparent meaning of the words of Scripture. The materialistic conception still grew, and invaded the higher ecclesiastical ranks, so that two centuries later, when Berengarius restated the primitive doctrine, that the bread and wine were not Christ, but were the means of conveying the benefits of His death and passion to the soul if received with faith and love, he was regarded as an innovator, and brought before Synods and Popes for heresy. One of the Popes was Hildebrand (Gregory VII.). Hildebrand hesitated; "he was not sure himself," but he, too, had to yield to the pressure from below, and by his command Berengarius made confession that "the bread and the wine placed upon the altar are, by the mystery of holy prayer and the words of our Redeemer, converted into the true, actual, and life-giving Flesh and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and are after consecration the true Body of Christ, which was born of the Virgin, and which hung on the Cross an offering for the salvation of the world, not only in the way of sign and in virtue of a sacrament, but also in propriety of nature and truth of substance."

Two things still remained, one to give a name and authority to the new doctrine that had won its way to the mastery of the Western Church, the other to construct an intellectual support for it. The Lateran Council, A.D. 1215, supplied the first need, the Realistic Schoolmen the second. Intelligent thinkers could not

hold the common people's belief of a physical change. The question must be taken out of the sphere of physics and transferred to that of metaphysics. The theory of Realism seemed to be the *Deus ex machina* to effect this.

When we look at a number of tables of different sizes and shapes, by disregarding their differences we get a general idea of a table ; when we look at a number of men and women, differing in colour, height, and looks, by disregarding these differences we get the general idea of man. These general ideas are creations of our minds. They have no objective existence in themselves outside our minds, but the Realists did not understand that their existence was only subjective. They held that they had a real substantial existence of their own ; and more, that every table that we see, comes to be a table only by partaking of the table-substance ; and that every man comes to be a man only by partaking of the man-substance. The *Schola theologorum*, whose business it was to find arguments for the new doctrine, grasped eagerly at the realistic theory. Here, they said, are indicated the relations of the bread and of the Body of Christ. By consecration we do not take away the properties or appearances of bread, but the bread-substance lying beneath them, which makes the bread to be bread ; and we substitute for that bread-substance the flesh-substance, which makes the Body of Christ to be a body. With this theory they were content. They did not apprehend, or they kept it in the background, that on the very principles of the philosophy in which they took refuge, the cessation of the bread-substance must make the properties and appearances of bread to cease also ; and that the

substituted body-substance could not either lose the properties and appearance of a body, or invest itself with those of bread. But it was hardly worth while for opponents thus to point out the invalidity of the hypothesis, for very soon the whole theory of Realism was overthrown by Conceptualists and Nominalists, and it was proved and acknowledged that there was no such thing at all as a supposed metaphysical substance separable from its phenomena. With Realism the only argumentative prop for transubstantiation fell, and no other has ever been erected. Henceforth its supporters justified it, not by argument but by the authority of the Roman See. "The chief thing is to hold about it what the holy Roman Church holds," said Duns Scotus. "I prove that the bread is changed into the Body of Christ, because we must hold what the Roman Pontiff says must be held" (Joan. Bacon). In other words, acceptance of the unintelligible, on the authority of Rome, had to be substituted for intelligent belief. When compelled to argue, the transubstantiationist still falls back on the exploded Realism.

The change which took place in the conception entertained as to the result of consecration on the bread and wine could not but affect the conception entertained of the Eucharistic sacrifice. At first men offered in the Eucharist praise and thanksgivings to God, and that was a sacrifice (Heb. xiii. 15); they offered prayer, and that was a sacrifice (Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 117, Tertull. *Ad Scap.* ii.); they offered of their goods, and that was a sacrifice (Phil. iv. 18); they offered themselves individually, and that was a sacrifice (Rom. xii. 1); they offered themselves as the mystical body of Christ collectively, and that was a sacrifice

(S. Augustine, *De Civ. Dei* x. and xix.); they offered bread and wine to the Creator in acknowledgment of His sovereignty and of our dependence on Him ("of Thine own have we given Thee," 1 Chron. xxix. 14), and that was a sacrifice; they offered the bread and wine in commemoration of Christ's offering on the Cross, and that was a commemorative sacrifice, or might be called so. And all these sacrifices were offerings made to a reconciled Father by His reconciled children, conscious of their reconciliation having been already effected, who for that reason approached their Father with the loving confidence of sons. But when men came to believe that the bread and wine were Christ Himself, not only did all other minor senses of sacrifice drop away from the rite, but a propitiatory force was attributed to the one sacrifice which was left. It passed over from the class of peace offerings to that of sin offerings. The offerer was no longer God's child, joyously feasting with its loving Father, to whom he had been brought nigh by the adoption in Christ; he was still in his sins; God's face was averted from him, and Christ was now being offered to God to serve as a propitiation and satisfaction and to restrain His wrath. We gather from the highest existing authorities in the Roman Church, S. Alfonso de' Liguori and Cardinal Bellarmine, that the present phase of the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass is as follows:—1. That when the consecration takes place Christ in His Divinity and Humanity, Spirit, Soul, and Body, enters on a sacramental existence on the Altar. 2. That He is there offered as a propitiatory sacrifice to the Father. 3. That His sacramental existence is again destroyed (else according to their definition there could be no sacrifice) by the

priests eating the wafer and drinking the wine; but that nevertheless, 4. He exists still in the consecrated wafers, where He may be worshipped until He is eaten by the teeth of the recipient.

Many other consequences follow from the doctrine of Transubstantiation beside that of the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass. Anselm's dogma of the Reception of the whole Christ under either of the two elements was a logical conclusion from it, and from that followed the denial of the cup. Reservation of the Sacrament for worship, Processions of the Host, Elevation, Hearing Mass or attendance without communicating, Worship of the Sacrament, Fasting Communion imposed as a necessity, the tenet of the eating of Christ's Body by the wicked, all result from the theory of Christ's entering into the bread and wine, or the appearances of bread and wine, on their consecration. From it consequences upon consequences have been drawn, from the eleventh century onwards, and are being drawn in our own day. *Le Manrèze du Prêtre* is a manual ordinarily employed in the annual retreat of French priests. In this manual the priests are assured that it is no exaggeration to equal them with God. "God created the universe, but our daily creation is no less than the Word Himself made flesh." "God can make other universes, but He cannot make under the sun a greater action than your sacrifice." "You are creators, as Mary was when she co-operated in the Incarnation." "Jesus dwells under your lock and key. His audiences are opened and closed by you. He does not move without your permission. He does not bless without your concurrence. He gives only by your hands, and this dependence is so dear to Him

that in more than 1800 years He has not for one instant escaped from the Church to return to His Father's glory."

The tenet of the objective presence of Christ in the sacred elements slipped into acceptance, as we have seen, almost imperceptibly, and without prevision of the future. In the above quotations we see the portentous consequences derived from it in the nineteenth century; and we have indications of further consequences already coming into sight, such as that the recipient partakes of the flesh of Mary, from whom Christ took His Body, and that Christ's incessant occupation of Heaven is offering to the Father His body, brought by the mystical agency of angels from every altar on earth at which a consecration takes place.

We now turn to England. No doubt the primitive and traditional doctrine that the bread and wine, being the symbols of His sacrificed Body and Blood, are means by which the benefits of the sacrifice of His death upon the cross are conveyed to the penitent and faithful soul, as it spiritually feeds upon Him, prevailed throughout the British Church before the Saxon invasion, as it did elsewhere. We may reasonably suppose that some of the heathen Saxons that were swept in masses into the fold of the Church by Augustine in the south and by Aidan and the Celtic missionaries in the north and midlands, like the Franks and other barbarians, misapprehended the Lord's words, and accepted them in a gross and materialistic sense, but we have no proof that this error of the multitude spread upwards to the educated classes and the clergy, of whom Archbishop Ælfric, who was free from any such taint, may be taken as a specimen. It was not formu-

lated before the Norman Conquest. Then Lanfranc and Anselm brought in from Bec the theology by this time prevalent in France and Italy, to which even Hildebrand had bowed. Lanfranc, unaware that he was himself the innovator, and believing himself to be a champion of orthodoxy, wrote a book to refute Berengarius, who represented the traditional but forgotten teaching of the Church ; and Anselm drew from the now accepted doctrine of a substantial presence of Christ in the elements the legitimate conclusion of reception in one kind. From this time onwards in England, as elsewhere in the west, the materialistic view became dominant, supported by the philosophy of Realism, as long as it prevailed, and on its overthrow by the authority of the Roman See. On the repudiation of the authority of the See of Rome there followed, not immediately, but necessarily, the rejection of transubstantiation and of the sacrifice of the mass. Cranmer and Ridley, perhaps the two most learned Prelates that have ever sat in English Sees, had been brought up in the Mediæval conception of the Eucharist. But they knew familiarly the writings of the Fathers and Divines of the first thousand years, and gradually they came to see the incompatibility of the mediæval with the primitive doctrine. Ridley was aided by Bertram or Ratramn's treatise of the ninth century, and having by its help cleared his own mind and resumed the theology of the early Church, he led Cranmer to the same standing-point as himself. We can imagine the discussions of these two seekers after truth, their references to Holy Scripture, to Augustine, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Gelasius, their longing after spirituality in the midst of the materialism with which

the faith had been corrupted. They may have had before them too the words of Wyclif, "This Sacrament is not naturally the Body of Christ, but the same Sacrament is Christ's Body figuratively. . . . That this venerable Sacrament is in its own nature veritable bread and sacramentally Christ's Body, is shown to be the true conclusion. Hardness, softness, &c., cannot exist *per se*, nor can they be the subject of other accidents; it remains therefore that there must be some subject as bread. Oh! how great diversity is between us that trow this Sacrament is very bread in its kind, and between heretics that tell us that it is an accident without subject" (*Trialogus*, Book IV.).

Ridley, in his "Brief Declaration of the Lord's Supper," states the two theories with the utmost clearness, concluding—1. That "there is no such thing in deed and in truth as they call transubstantiation, for the substance of bread remains still in the sacrament of the body." 2. That "the natural substance of Christ's human nature is in heaven, and not here enclosed under the form of bread." 3. That "that godly honour which is due only unto God is not to be done to the Holy Sacrament." 4. That "the wicked do not receive the natural substance of the blessed Body and Blood of Christ." 5. That "Christ's blessed Body and Blood, which was once only offered and shed upon the Cross, is offered up no more in the natural substance thereof, neither by the priest nor any other thing" (p. 109).

In the next generation the same doctrine was held by Hooker and by Andrewes. "If," says Hooker, "it is on all sides confessed that the grace of baptism is poured into the soul of man, that we receive it, though it be neither seated in the water, nor the water changed

into it, what should induce men to think that the grace of the Eucharist must needs be in the Eucharist before it can be in us that receive it? The real presence of Christ's blessed Body and Blood is not to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament" (*Eccles. Pol.* v. 6). Andrewes' words are so strong that, were it not that he is quoted as if he were on the other side of the question, we might shrink from using them. "That a memory is there made of the sacrifice we grant willingly; that your Christ made of bread is sacrificed there we will never grant. The King (James I.) knows that the word 'sacrifice' is used by the Fathers, and he does not put it among novelties, but your 'sacrifice of the Mass' he does" (*Answer to Bellarmine*, viii.). So with all the Caroline divines, beginning with Laud and ending with Bull; so with all the leaders of thought, and writers of the Anglican Church, down to the middle of the present century. Without exception they taught the doctrine of the Primitive, and condemned the doctrine of the Mediæval Church. But a short time before he left the Anglican for the Roman communion, Archdeacon Robert Isaac Wilberforce wrote a book on the Eucharist, restating and enforcing the mediæval doctrine, avoiding the word transubstantiation, but teaching an objective presence, which is best expressed by the formula of transubstantiation. Since that time others have been found within the Church of England to maintain the objective or even the substantial presence of Christ in the elements after consecration and before reception, and, as a consequence, to explain away the Church's condemnation of transubstantiation. But they represent only a back eddy in the main stream of the Church's teaching.

Historically then the question of the Eucharist stands thus. During the first century the Apostolic Church re-enacted the Last Supper, as far as that was possible, on the evening of the first day of every week, thus carrying out the command of their Lord, "Do this in remembrance of Me," in its amplest signification. What He had meant by calling the bread His Body, and by calling the wine His blood, they meant; but they were so far from regarding the bread as having become His Body and the wine His Blood that some of them, having grown careless, ceased to distinguish the sacred elements from the ordinary materials of a common meal, which, however shocking, is an eloquent testimony to the nature of St. Paul's teaching when he instituted the Lord's Supper. In the second century the re-enactment of the Last Supper still continued, but now the hour at which it was held was altered, from political causes external to the Church, to the morning. The memorial eating and drinking was made to precede the eating and drinking of the common meal, and was accompanied by ceremonies and prayers previously impossible. At the end of the century the social meal was once more transferred to the evening, and the spiritual feeding upon Christ by means of the appointed memorials, separated from its original surroundings, was celebrated in the forenoon of each Sunday in conjunction with the matin prayers. The thanksgiving for the fruits of the earth, which had hitherto been a part of the complex rite, being now relegated to the Agape, the writers and teachers of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, such as Cyprian, Augustine, and Chrysostom, dwelt the more urgently on the commemorative character of the Eucharistic partaking, frankly calling the

bread the Body and the wine the Blood of Christ, but explaining that when they spoke of the Eucharist as a *sacrifice*, they meant a *memorial* of the sacrifice of Christ. The gross imagination of His actual Body and Blood being eaten and drunk, and of the Lord Himself being sacrificed, had not yet emerged; and natural reverence as well as the traditional teaching of the Church made the very thought inadmissible. But from the sixth century onwards the rude conception of the uneducated masses that had been swept wholesale into the fold of the Church began to prevail over the traditional belief, making itself heard in the ninth century, and in the eleventh century triumphing over all opposition in Western Christendom. The elements were no longer types through which the realities that they represented were conveyed to the soul, but they were those realities themselves. Christ was present, not only in the heart of the believer, but in the elements after consecration and before reception. Educated theologians, overwhelmed by this inflow of popular superstition, fled to the philosophy of Realism as a resource against the outcries of their reason, and when that philosophy fell, substituted for rational explanation the now dominant authority of the Roman See. Wherever the influence of that See has prevailed, the doctrines of Transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of the Mass have prevailed likewise. In the sixteenth century those nations which repudiated the authority of the Roman See repudiated also the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and, with the exception of the immediate followers of Luther, the doctrine of any objective presence in the sacred elements. The Church of England, as proved by her formularies and the teaching of all her divines down to the present

century, returned to the primitive view that the bread and wine are the types, symbols, and figures of the Body and Blood of Christ ; that what is conveyed to the mouth is bread and wine, set apart for a sacred purpose, and that by receiving these elements in a faithful and humble spirit the recipient is enabled to feed upon Christ in his soul, and receives the benefits wrought for man by the one true and proper Sacrifice of the Cross.

CHAPTER XI

PROTESTANTISM

By the EDITOR

THE centre of Christian thought has twice been shifted in the course of history; first from the East to the West, then from the southern to the northern West. Thus the development falls at once into three great periods, each with its own peculiar task, and a character of its own almost entirely shaped by one great race. The Greek does the work for several hundred years, and then stiffens into monumental orthodoxy. Then the Latin takes up his work till he has brought the Catholic Church to something very like paganism in the age of the Renaissance: and since the Reformation the new thought of Christendom has been almost wholly Teutonic.

As soon as Christianity outgrew its Jewish cradle, it of necessity became a Greek religion. Greek culture was supreme, and of necessity shaped the expression—not the substance—of Christian belief. There is no such contrast as is fancied between the Sermon on the Mount and the Nicene Creed. Even the marvellous teaching of the Sermon on the Mount is less impressive than the unspoken challenge of the Teacher. Who is this that says, Ye have heard what God said to them of old; but I tell you something better? This surely is the question that comes first; and the Greeks did

right in seizing on it and working it out to an answer in the Nicene Creed. The revelation is not directly of morality, but of the Lord who is Himself the way, as well as the truth and the life, so that the Person of the Lord was the first and fundamental problem of the Gospel. Now Greek thought had in the providence of God reached a stage in which it was eminently qualified for the work, trained as it was by philosophy to seek for truth, and wielding a language of unrivalled precision and subtlety. Yet more, the old Greek belief in man, which tempted the pagans to deify men, also helped the Christians to realise the old Gospel of Creation which enabled them to see that divine and human in the Incarnation are not foreign to each other but near akin, and therefore capable of a perfect union in Christ for evermore. This was the conviction which guided the Eastern Church through two of the four great struggles of Christian thought, that with Gnosticism, against a tyrannous philosophy which trifled with the historic facts of the Gospel and explained away the Lord's humanity; and that with Arianism, against a tyrannous philosophy which confessed indeed the historic facts, but explained away the Lord's divinity.

Presently the Greek Church came to a stop. Its task was to ascertain the outlines of the revelation; and this was fairly completed when the Council of Chalcedon rose, though they still went on refining the theoretic truth of the Lord's Person till Iconoclasm burst in to convict them of gross idolatry. The causes of the stop are fairly clear. The Church was too closely connected with the Empire not to share its decline and assume something of the same fossilised

Byzantine form. Again, the Greek search for truth was too purely intellectual, and tended to a barren orthodoxy which might shelter strange growths of untruth and superstition. Again, even their noble defence of the Lord's divinity tempted them to forget His manhood, and by a natural reaction to worship saints who seemed to give them back the human sympathy they could no longer look for in the gracious Lord. Indeed, even Athanasius speaks of Him far more as a theological Person than as a man who lived among men. Beyond all this there was the unrecognised difficulty that theological truth does not stand alone, but has the closest relation to other truth which is equally divine, but which could not yet be effectively compared with it. Doctrinal questions necessarily engrossed attention for a long time; but in the fact that the Gospel is history and life, not philosophy and dogma, lay the pledge that sooner or later it would be the clue to truth in all its range.

First, however, came a set-back of a thousand years. Latin Christendom started on a lower plane, and was more deeply influenced by the stronger paganism of the West. If the Greek evaporated the Gospel into philosophy, the Latin hardened it into law. He never was much interested in the Greek discussions of the Person of the Lord, and accepted the decisions of the Eastern Councils chiefly as a matter of law and order. He was a practical man, and therefore began at the other end, from the practical fact that mankind lies in sin. He thought it too speculative to look on the Incarnation as the manifestation in time of an eternal humanity that is in God. He was content to regard it as the practical remedy for sin, to be dispensed

according to the law and order of the Church. In this life, and most of all in the evil days of barbarian invasion and feudal anarchy, sin seemed nearer than salvation, and the Church seemed nearer than an absent Lord. So Western thought did most of its original work in the monasteries, and on doctrines hardly mentioned in the Eastern creeds. It revolved round original sin, predestination, grace, atonement, justification, sacraments, and above all, the authority and functions of the Church. The East remembered that Christ is the revelation of man, and began with Christ: the West forgot that fallen man is no revelation of Christ, and began with man. This was the Arian error of order pointed out by Athanasius; and it was mischievous also in the West.

This low view of man determined the whole attitude of the Latin Church. So far as man is a child of God, he can be reasoned with, but so far as he is a beast without understanding, he must be kept in order like a beast without understanding; so that a low view of human nature emphasizes and enlarges the functions of authority and law. In this way the Latin Church tended to become a judge and a divider rather than a witness. It was from the first much too ready to silence inconvenient questions by an appeal to authority and order; and this tendency increased when it undertook the training of the northern nations, again when the world turned to the Church for help in the eleventh century, and yet again when the world began to rebel against the Church in the later Middle Ages. Education is a hard task, and Rome thought she did well when she let go the Greek theology as unpractical, concentrating herself on a few main doctrines, and

building round them rampart after rampart of Church observance. It seemed a great thing to save any Christianity at all from the wild passions of northern barbarians. The policy was tempting: yet it was not St. Paul's policy, even in the slums of Corinth. The Apostles had but one gospel of Christ crucified for wise and unwise, and taught men to hold it for themselves, not to lean on saints and confessors, images and exorcisms, vain repetitions and sensuous rituals, and such like "helps for the weak." If men needed them in the Middle Ages and until now, they did not need them then, though some were "weak in the faith" at Rome already. The Latin Church forgot the image of God in man, and did not notice that her own glorious victories were not won in the strength of helps forsooth like these, but in the might of love divine, which can burst its way through all of them. More and more it seemed unfit that sinful men should presume to speak directly to the sinless Christ, or rather to the terrible Judge of all. So more and more the Virgin and the saints replaced Him in the worship of the people, and more and more the Church became the real mediator between God and men. The Church was the one dispenser of grace, and outside it there was no salvation. The Church was the one mouthpiece of God's will, and from its commands there was no appeal to conscience. The Church was the one interpreter of God's truth, and from its decisions there was no appeal to reason. In this way church authority was made the single and sufficient test of truth.

And church authority along with the Church itself had fallen into discredit before the Reformation. Reason revolted at the quarrelling popes, and con-

science at the scandalous popes. Were these the Vicars of Christ? Transubstantiation was an insult to common sense, auricular confession a defilement of purity, and wilful treachery to heretics an outrage on common truthfulness. Christendom cowered under Amurath's rebuke at Varna. And had the Church Christ's authority to make traffic of God's forgiveness, and to turn purgatory into a bottomless treasure for the pope? Whatever was true, these things must be false; and it was time to bring the Church to account for them.

The Church, however, was not easily brought to account. The profane might scoff at hocus-pocus and make songs on the disreputable popes, and the learned might tear in pieces the False Decretals and such like pious frauds; but men's hearts misgave them at the thought of serious conflict. The Church seemed as strong as ever, entrenched behind its twin strongholds of transubstantiation and auricular confession. The one made the priest almost a god on earth, the other laid private life at his mercy. In fact the Church was stronger in one direction than it ever was before. Now that it leaned on princes, it no longer needed to stir up a Pataria to lynch the married clergy, but could use the power of the State to put down its rebels. The Church was never so terrible to its enemies as when it neared its fall in northern Europe.

The Reformation was the stormy centre of an age of revolution. First the revival of learning revealed an older and nobler literature than that of Rome, an older Bible than the Vulgate. The decayed and worn-out world grew fair and young beneath the spell of Greece. Peradventure it was not so bad as the Church made

out. Then the discovery of America and the Cape let loose the spirit of adventure like a new crusade. The conquest of Mexico is a romance as brilliant as the siege of Antioch. The Turkish conquest of Egypt and the ruin of Italy completed the revolution of commerce. The political work of the age was the struggle against the overwhelming power of Spain, the struggle maintained by France till she sank into the confusion of the religious wars, and then by the tiny Dutch republic till the decisive blow was struck by England. When France recovered herself under Henry IV., the danger was over for awhile. A second period of contest followed in the Thirty Years' War, so that the struggles of the Reformation extended to the Peace of Westphalia in 1648.

At one time the Reformation bade fair to cover most of Europe ; but its advance was checked by its own divisions, and by the crafts and assaults of the Jesuits and of the princes they trained. Its permanent conquests were limited to England and the Teutonic North, dividing Germany and securing toleration for a time in France. Thus the Pope lost half his domain ; but he gained a much stronger hold on what remained to him. The Council of Trent reformed the Church of Rome, though the reform was only of scandals and abuses, for the doctrine underlying them was not reformed at all—only the reins of government were drawn much tighter. And from that day to this the Church of Rome has gone on the same line, consolidating and developing the old doctrinal system in opposition to Protestantism, and tightening yet again the reins of government to breaking point. Will it be endured much longer in America ? However, we have

done with Rome. She has had her mystics ; but her Church in general has contributed very little to Christian thought since the Reformation. She has chiefly dealt in unhealthy casuistry, false miracles and novel superstitions, and anatomical devotions.

The Greek Church laid out the outlines of Christian doctrine, the Latin guarded them through the evil times ; the task of the Reformation was to find some better test of truth for them than the church authority which had gone so grievously wrong. Three main forms of Protestantism emerged—Lutheranism, Calvinism, and the Church of England—Zwingli is too isolated to count as a fourth, though on some points (not the sacraments, if he really differed here from Calvin) he is in advance of both Luther and Calvin. These three then agreed in rejecting the Pope and the mischievous developments of the Middle Ages, accepting the ancient creeds, and restoring what they deemed to be the primitive doctrine and government of Christ's Church. In this sense they may be each called catholic. They were further agreed on Justification by faith only, on the supremacy of Scripture, and in general on Predestination also. The English reformers generally went with Calvin in this matter, though fortunately they never made it a binding doctrine of the English Church. On these three doctrines the three groups of reformers were in the main agreed ; but each group laid the emphasis in a different way.

Justification by faith only was to the Lutheran the *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiæ*. He might compromise on other matters if need were, but this was vital. It looks scholastic, and in fact it lent itself before long to a scholasticism as wearisome and un-

spiritual as any that had gone before. But in its proper and original meaning it is nothing else than St. Paul's doctrine (almost forgotten, except among the mystics), that God calls us to know Him directly, not simply to hear of Him through the Church ; to receive our forgiveness and do good works in the strength it brings, not to set about the hopeless task of buying forgiveness with works of law. Thus Church and State are alike holy. The Church was made for man, not man for the Church—for Rome had gone back to her old heathen sacrifice of the individual to the society. Individualism, which in the evil days had fled for refuge to the selfish cowardice of the monastery, had in the mendicants renounced the selfishness, and in the Reformation it thanked God and took courage to face the duties of that state of life to which He should please to call it. The victory of faith is not that which fleeth from the world.

Calvinism proclaimed the same fundamental truth—the supreme sacredness of the individual—but preached it in the doctrine of predestination. Calvinism is out of fashion in our time ; and if we mix it up with Arminianism, as most of its enemies do, the compound is as diabolical as they say ; but if we take it fairly, and therefore as a whole, it will be found rather one-sided than untrue. The difficulty is not in predestination, but in the doctrine of hell fire that was commonly held with it, for the Bible is full of predestination—to everything except perdition. Are not all the gifts born with us matter of predestination ? Calvinism bore the brunt of battle with Rome ; yet in its fundamental ideas it is much nearer to Rome than either Lutheranism or the Church of England. Was not Calvin the one great reformer not of Teutonic birth ? He held and even

hardened the Latin conception of God as a Roman emperor in heaven, an inscrutable despot in a far country—though he tempered it with a much firmer hold than Rome's on Christ and His manhood—and worked it out into a system of Church government and discipline as rigid as the Roman, and as regardless of the State. The real objection to Calvinism is that it was too Romish. It took over persecution, for example, from the Church of Rome ; and if it taught that infants deserve damnation, what else did the old English baptismal service teach, with its four successive exorcisms of all the devils from the infant ? Calvinism saved some by election, Rome saved some by baptism : the rest were a *massa perditionis*. But the freedom which Calvinism took away with one hand was often given back by the other. The true ideal of our heart is not the caprice of roving fancy, but the rest of a service which is perfect freedom. As the old monk had found this in willing and complete submission to God's calling in the rule of his house, so the Calvinist found it in willing and complete submission to God's calling in his Bible. And there he found something that lifted him above his baser self. Had not the Most High foreknown him from eternity ? Had not the Saviour died for His elect ? Was not the call to good works as much as to salvation ? He could do them too, because his strength was not his own, but given him from on high, and given him for the very purpose. The living power of Calvinism—the inner meaning of predestination—was the conviction it shared with Lutheranism and with the mystics of all ages, that sovereign Love can save without the help of men—

"Thou must save, and Thou alone."

Calvinism has fought some of the hardest of Christ's battles in the world; and its failure was the common failure of Western Christendom to reach the fulness of the Gospel, that Christ should taste of death for *every* man.

The English Reformation ran a different course. It bears the stamp of no one great man, but that of the nation itself. It is as national as the Swedish. It was the work of the State (the Church was more than once compelled to acquiesce), and therefore its aim was practical, not to work out a theory with French completeness, but to remedy practical evils and do no more. If Edward served the theorists a little, and Mary served them much, Elizabeth soon brought things back to common sense. She at least understood England. The royal supremacy was true conservatism as well as needful reformation. If Henry used his power tyrannically, the power itself was only what the old kings had used before him, and later kings had never abandoned. If he restrained Convocation, this was only the Conqueror's law, that nothing should be enacted by Church councils but what he had himself ordained beforehand. As soon as the Church had been properly subjected to the State, the way was clear, first for the reform of abuses, then for the revision of doctrine. And here a Conservative policy was followed. The reformers did not change for the sake of change, and were as far as possible from the Puritan idea that nothing was right which Rome had done, or which is not expressly commanded in Scripture. So they changed no practice unless it was "vain or superstitious," and altered no doctrine unless it was "repugnant to the plain words of Scripture," or at least "could not

be proved by Scripture." In some ways then they made little change. The old creeds were retained, the prayers were to a large extent the old ones translated, the succession of bishops was carefully preserved, and even their old jurisdiction was to some extent continued. This generally Conservative policy gives a double emphasis to the changes they did make. And these changes are much deeper than the Calvinistic. No Church has ever put on record a more deliberate and comprehensive repudiation of the distinctive ideals of Latin Christianity. Other Churches have taught the supremacy of Scripture over Church tradition ; but no Church has ever taken such pains to make that supremacy effective. It is not merely that Scripture is constantly appealed to for proof, and even the creeds are only to be received and believed because "they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." Rome quotes too, though very commonly in a *super grammaticam* sense. It is not merely that Scripture saturates our Liturgy, and that it is read to the people more fully and systematically than in any other Church. The laity also are encouraged (not forbidden) to read it freely for themselves ; and the clergy at priests' orders are urgently exhorted "to be studious in reading and learning the Scriptures," and give their solemn promise to teach nothing as necessary "but what they are persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture," and "to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word." The decisive point is that the meaning of Scripture is left for reason to determine. No judge is constituted ; and all human infallibility is utterly denied. Is it in Churches ? All the great Churches have "erred, not only in their

living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith." Is it in Councils? "General[1] Councils may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God." Is it in the Pope? He "hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England." The Church is "a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ," not its final interpreter. It is assumed here that Scripture is reasonably clear on essentials, and that the Holy Spirit will so far guide every one who truly seeks Him. Truth within will recognise God's truth without. Here then in the midst of care for the society comes the fullest assertion of individualism that any Church has ever made. Private judgment is not private licence, but a necessity we cannot escape, and there can be no faith without it. The most besotted of infallibilists depends on it as absolutely as the most blatant of freethinkers, only he likes a quick way down from the pinnacle of the temple.

The promise of the Reformation was hardly realised, though the next generation was a splendid period on both sides of the North Sea. A great and complex movement is not to be judged by the scandals of its beginnings—we do not measure the French Revolution simply by the Reign of Terror—and the value of the Reformation is not so much in what it did, as in what it made possible. Now that the method was found, the advance would come sooner or later. Now that the great tyrant was checked, there was less danger from the petty tyrants who came after him. They were only shadows that would pass away. But there

[1] The reformers made no distinction between Œcumenical (East *and* West) and General (East *or* West) Councils. When Jewell denounces the General Council of Trent as a sham, his first question is, Where are the Greeks? Even Sancta Clara (no mean special pleader) seems ignorant of the evasion.

were plenty of them, for the Epigoni of Protestantism shrank from the vision of liberty, and tried hard to get back into slavery. Lutheranism soon lost itself in the scholastic jangle, and Calvinism followed a little later; and in England the reactionary Carolines came to power under the Stuarts. Yet England fared much better than the continent, for even Laud was no traitor; and it was good to have a voice for decency and order, and a protest against the exclusive dominance of Calvinism. Meanwhile the religious wars were brutalising, and sometimes utterly ruinous; and toleration and charity were not likely to grow up among Protestants as long as they were compelled to fight a battle of life and death against an implacable enemy who systematically used and glorified the resources of treachery and assassination. There is no more skilful devilry in history than the work of the Catholic reaction in that age; and the only marvel is that the struggle against it did not make the Protestants a great deal worse than they were.

The peace of Westphalia was a peace of exhaustion for Germany; and a few years later England settled down for awhile under the Restoration, and France under Louis XIV., so that there was a clear pause in the wars of religion. It is not accidental that Science now came forward to make its decisive advance. Modern science is the nursling of Christianity. The unity of God implied the unity of Nature, the Incarnation implied the dignity of man which gave research a worthy object, and the Christian duty of patient and impartial search for truth pointed out the scientific method of research. Advance was checked first by an asceticism which "despised the world," then by an

infallible Church which reduced Science to a minor department of Theology, and decided questions even of criticism by authority, as it notably did at Trent ; and now that the Reformation had renounced asceticism and limited the province of the Church, the advance was checked for another century by the noise of the doctrinal disputes and the wars they caused. But now the way was free, the method clear. It was time for a revelation to come up from the earth to meet the revelation which had come down from heaven.[1] Nature is as truly God's word as Scripture ; and now that Scripture had unsealed it, the time was come to compare God's new Book with His old. This has been the work of the last two hundred years and more ; and if it has searched out the weaknesses of Christian theories, it has also revealed Christ on a new side, and unveiled whole worlds of glory which our fathers never knew.

England and Germany both had two great religious movements between the Reformation and the French Revolution, one to piety, and one to scepticism. But in Germany the pietistic movement came before the sceptical ; in England Deism culminated before the Methodist Revival. It was but one sign of the widespread weariness of Church controversies, which the Cambridge Platonists represented from the side of mysticism, the Latitudinarians from that of common sense. The Deists also stood for common sense; but unlike Tillotson, they went far beyond the limits of English orthodoxy. The floating doubts of half a century were summed up on their behalf by Matthew Tindall in 1730. Christianity is "as old as Creation," because it is a republication of Natural Religion and

[1] Hort *Hulsean Lectures*, ch. ii.

nothing more. So far as it is this, it deserves respect, though truly it is not much needed; but anything more than this is harmful, or at best useless.

Deism was really too shallow. It could not be more than a passing phase of thought, even in an age which had so little sense of mystery. The French were behind the times when they dressed it up (with a little sentiment from Rousseau) to be the Gospel of the Revolution. Yet Deism is no unworthy opening to the great contest whose end our children may not live to see, for it threw down among the people the questions it raised, and they have never rested since. Is the Bible credible? Are miracles possible? Is atonement needed for sin? Deism itself never went on (though others soon did) to the final question—Is there a God at all? and if so, can we know Him? It was good that the questions should be raised, that some of the huge masses of unbelief which lurk in all conventional religion should be brought to light. Faith is never secure till unfaith has been probed to the bottom. Better any wrangling than unreasoning orthodoxy, for there is no poison so deadly as God's own truth if swallowed whole. Wesley was right when he welcomed the Deists to laugh the Christianity out of the nominal Christians who are none the better for the name they bear, "and then He whom neither you nor they know now, shall rise and gird Himself with strength, and go forth in His almighty love, and sweetly conquer you all together."[1]

Meanwhile Science came on like a giant, and dealt at every step another blow at human pride. Astronomy reduced the world of men to a mere atom of the

[1] *Works*, ix. 77.

universe, geology reduced the human period to an insignificant fraction of the earth's duration, and evolution firmly linked man himself to the beasts that perish. And if all is law, where shall we find room for our Father in heaven? Is not revelation finally disproved? Not at all. The science which abases man reveals a glory of God which fills earth as well as heaven with a splendour undreamed of in past ages. And to that we must lift up our hearts. What if God is in the world as well as above it, immanent with the Greeks as well as transcendent with the Latins? What if rather the world is in God, and in Him lives and moves and has its being? What if law is no arbitrary appointment, but the expression of a Nature in which there is neither variableness nor shadow of turning? Its awful unrelenting sternness proves indeed that God is not easy-going good nature; but not that He is other than Love. Is it not the very thing we ought to expect from Love too strong to change in moods, too faithful to spare us the self-sacrifice which makes us like Himself, the suffering through which the final summing-up in Christ is working out from age to age? He that spared not His own Son, will He spare us?

The French Revolution and the wars of Napoleon cleared away the wrecks of mediævalism from Europe, and a peace of more than fourscore years has followed, broken chiefly by the struggle which transferred the military leadership from a Latin to a Teutonic power. It was now time that yet a third revelation should come back from the past to meet the revelation which had come down from heaven. Marvellous as the work of Science has been, and yet more marvellously as it grows from year to year, I still incline to

think that History is quite as much as Science the special message to our own time, and that it is giving us a second and not less thorough sifting of our Western thoughts concerning God and man. History was of necessity fragmentary among the old heathens, with their "godless multitude of gods" and hatred of barbarians; for the unity of God was needed to reveal the unity of mankind, and to give worth and meaning to the obscure fightings of barbarian peoples. The Incarnation is the philosophy of history, as St. Paul showed in his Epistles to the Romans and Ephesians, so that his clues needed only to be followed up. The Apologists and the Alexandrians did something, Augustine did something more; but no great advance was possible till the Reformation had lifted the dead weight of authority, nor even then till fairly settled peace returned to Europe, for the first time in fourteen hundred years. Scripture gave the method of research to Science and History in common; and Scripture gave to History through Science the illuminating thought of evolution. The teaching of History is less advanced and less generally understood at present than that of Science; but it is not less profoundly influencing our ideas of revelation.

On the Old Testament we must speak with caution, for we are still in the thick of the battle. But it may safely be said that the moral difficulties become less formidable the more clearly we recognise that Israel had no more than the dawn of the light which we believe is shining more and more unto the perfect day. Nor need we fear for the general result, though the book be sifted as never book was sifted yet. God's guidance of Israel in a direction contrary to the

national character is much too deeply marked on Israel's history to be overlooked by any reasonable student: and whatever modifications of current opinions about the method of that guidance truth may finally require, they cannot but be so many avenues to truth which is now obscured.

On the New Testament the results are clearer; and they are not in the sceptic's favour. One Epistle is no longer St. Paul's, and another is no longer to the Ephesians only. The Apocalypse is shifted back to Nero's time, and perhaps the First Epistle of Peter thrown forward to Vespasian's. A few passages are spurious, though not all even of these are unhistorical; and a few more are doubtful. But these are secondary matters: seventy years of searching study have only settled the historical integrity of the New Testament as a whole more firmly than it stood before. Nobody, for instance, would now date St. John's Gospel as Baur did, some seventy years after the Apostle's death; and nobody would now feel it safe to charge St. Luke with the gross historical blunders that were so freely fathered on him a generation ago. But there are deeper things than these outward evidences. The student is even more impressed by the subtle accuracy of the language, and by the subtle harmonies of thought which unfold themselves more and more to patient and truthful study, harmonies not only with other parts of Scripture, but with the course of Nature and the course of History, and most of all with the spiritual truth we have already learned by living it. Must not such words as these be words of life eternal?

Yet History gives no countenance to the rigid systems of Western Orthodoxy, whether they call them-

selves Protestant or Catholic. History joins its witness to that of Scripture, that even so far as they are true, they cannot be the vital things men take them for. The Gospel is neither a Protestant idea nor a Catholic organisation, neither a Greek philosophy nor a Latin law, but a living Person including and transcending all of them, a living Person on whom faith can feed continually, and only faith, for it is a plain absurdity to fancy that anything else can have touch of spiritual things. The witness of History confirms the instinct of every spiritual man, that the questions of government, of discipline, of ritual, of dogma, which occupy the noisy world are very minor matters, however needful it be to get some of them settled. History points us back with solemn emphasis to Christ himself. All Christian doctrine is summed up in Christ's Person, all Christian morality in Christ's example.

The warning we had of late, that we are more Latin than we know,[1] is not only for the silly creatures who are always bewitched with the last new finery, if only they hear say it comes from Rome. Some of our stoutest Protestants also are enslaved to Latin glosses on the Gospel. If the Reformation broke the yoke of bondage, it could not of itself cast out the spirit of slavery. Only "the truth shall make you free;" and the truth is Christ, not Protestantism, far less Romanism. Rome has not always towered over Christendom. She was a minor power when she committed schism against the Holy Orthodox Church a thousand years ago; and she will be a minor power a hundred years hence, if she cannot conquer England. The future is not with the Latin Church, unless God

[1] Wilson *Hulsean Lectures*, 143.

raise it from the dead. We shall find a better guide, though still but a human help, in the older Church of God which flourished before the times of Roman greatness. The same Providence which has brought us round to the old problems of Christ's Person also bids us take them up again. The knowledge of Christ is the revelation of man ; and we need it even for the reconstruction of society which is the visible task of our time ; for only in the light of His sinless purity dare we look up the steep ascents to heights of human nature towering as far above the angels as the deeps of sin are sunk below the beasts that perish. Yet we may not—we cannot—take up the old Greek problems quite on the old Greek lines, as if all things had continued as they were from the beginning, since the fathers of Chalcedon fell asleep. Christ reveals Himself to us in the Latin Church, which laboured for a thousand years to teach the law and order if not the freedom of the Gospel ; in the Reformation which tore in sunder the unspiritual unity of Western Europe, and broke the yoke of human infallibility ; in the students of Nature who have scrutinised the universe from the far away stars to the dust of our feet and the nerves of our body ; in the students of History who have sifted every word of Scripture with microscopic accuracy, and traced with loving care God's training of the world from Ur of the Chaldees to yesterday's newspaper. The change from the times of Origen and Athanasius is the change from a winter to a summer landscape. Every tree is there, and every twig ; but almost hidden by the glory of the spring with which our God has clothed it. In Christ all things are holy. In Christ the Bible is holier than to the men who make

it an idol, for its record is of Christ; and the Church is holier than to the men who make it a goddess, for its witness is of Christ. "The old things are passed away; behold, they are become new." As we look back through the long ages of history, we see the evil consuming itself, the good perishing only to return in new and nobler forms. The day of the Lord is burning round us even now; and on the decision of England rests her future. We must go forward, if we are not to be choked in the backwash of a dead superstition. A mere return to Protestantism would now be as unbelieving as a mere return to Romanism. But the signs are rather signs of hope. The blending of parties of late years, their willingness (would it were more!) to learn truth from one another, is a pledge that Christ has not forsaken us. And in Christ all the questions of our heart are answered, and all our discords have their everlasting peace and harmony.

CHAPTER XII

ROMANISM SINCE THE REFORMATION

By the Rev. Chancellor LIAS, M.A.

THE present volume of Essays is, as I take it, an attempt to recur to the first principles of the Reform movement in the sixteenth century, as a preliminary to the application of them to the problems which await us in the century now so close at hand. Those principles have been sufficiently treated by those who have gone before. For me, whose difficult task it is to sum up in a few pages the conflict between the absolutist and the reforming principles since the close of the Council of Trent, it must suffice to say that the Reformation presents itself to us under two aspects, the one temporary, the other permanent. The dogmatic basis on which the principal Reforming systems were erected has been unquestionably proved to have been temporary. Yet at the time such a dogmatic basis was both necessary and unavoidable; necessary, because in that age it was found impossible to meet the majestic and prescriptive claims of Rome on so wide a basis as that of free thought and free inquiry alone; unavoidable, because the Reformers themselves approached the questions of their day with minds trained in the mediæval schools of theology, and great men though they were, they were unable altogether to shake off the prejudices, and emancipate themselves from the

traditions, of the theological systems in which they had been brought up. Scholars and thinkers like Colet, Erasmus, Fisher, and More, were doubtless abstractedly right in their desire to see philosophic and dispassionate inquiry take the place of religious bigotry. But they were before their age. Strong religious convictions, and the passions and energy they engender, were necessary in the Reformation era, if the conscience of Europe was to be stirred to a struggle with the gigantic spiritual authority at that time wielded by the Pope. Colet, *felix opportunitate mortis*, died before the storm had burst. The others, timidly and unwisely, as I must believe, shrunk from taking their part in a conflict in which they fully sympathised with neither party, and took refuge in the haven provided for them by authority and custom. There is at least one excuse for them. The philosophic mind, accustomed to reflect, to discuss, to balance probabilities, is somewhat apt to fail us in times of stress. The philosopher is the man of all ages. Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli, as well as the English Reformers, were the men of their own day. They applied the training they had received to what they felt to be the needs of the hour, and they generated an amount of spiritual force which enabled them practically to deal with those needs. But the bottles in which that spiritual force was confined have of late "decayed and waxen old," and are like to burst with the pressure of modern opinion. The Lutheran and Calvinist systems of theology, so long dominant among Protestants, are on the point of "vanishing away." Men on all sides are recurring to the first principles of Christianity itself, and if there be any presentment of those principles which is more likely to find favour

than any other in the coming age, it is that which is found in the writers of the Alexandrian school in the third and fourth centuries.

To the permanent and therefore more important aspect of the work of the Reformers scant justice, I must confess, seems to have been done of late. Not only has a determined effort been made during the last fifty years to rehabilitate Roman and mediæval opinion among us, but even liberal thinkers, in their earnest desire to be candid, have of late shown less gratitude to, and less appreciation of the men in the sixteenth century who won for us the freedom we now enjoy, than they deserve. If a portion of their work was transitory, there is another part of it for which the world is permanently indebted to them. And this in two ways. First, the civil and religious liberty we now enjoy, which has spread so many blessings around, and which we may hope is our permanent heritage, is exclusively traceable to the action taken by the Reformers; and next, the spirit of reform itself which they evoked is still at work among us. The Reformation was not confined to the sixteenth century, though it began then. It has been operating ever since, and never more widely and effectually than at the present moment. In truth the spirit of reform is the spirit of Christianity. Or may we not rather say, it is the Spirit of the living God, who can never cease His efforts until He has destroyed every abuse, every perversion or denial of God's truth, and has brought not only every form of human life, but every thought of the human heart, into captivity to the law of Christ.

The secret of Luther's vast success was that he gave voice to the long-suppressed yearnings of thousands of his contemporaries. His defiance to the

powers that be penetrated like wildfire throughout the West; but the infant Hercules to which his protests gave birth had still many labours to achieve before it reached maturity, and many more still await it before it is destined to achieve its final triumph. Governments took fright at the new force which had been introduced into the world. Despotic monarchs instinctively perceived that religious freedom and civil freedom could not be separated. And so they set themselves to put down the former by axe and gibbet, fire and sword, wherever their authority reached, in order to preserve themselves from the danger of the latter. The new doctrines were, in the first instance, often suppressed by torture and the executioner before they had any time to take root. In those cases it was no wonder if the new inspiration soon died out. The first occasion on which the world was called upon to witness the death-grapple between despotism and liberty, civil as well as religious, was the war of Independence, partly religious and partly secular, between Spain and Holland. At the outset, all the success was on the side of discipline and authority. The task of the fathers of civil and religious liberty at first seemed hopeless. The patriots were beaten in almost every action; the Spanish arms proceeded almost unresisted throughout the land. The most fiendish cruelties, the blackest perfidy, the most cynical contempt for human suffering, were not sufficient to rouse even a maddened people to successful resistance. One might have fancied, as one witnessed the repeated hideous scenes of treachery and bloodshed, that, as an English chronicler said of his country in the days of Stephen, "God and His saints slept." But at length the tide turned. "The heavens themselves" seemed at

last to "strike" at Spanish "injustice." "The Lord arose as one out of sleep and as a giant refreshed with wine," when the Spaniards retreated from before Leyden, baffled by Dutch valour combined with the fury of the elements. The same thing was repeated twenty years after, at the climax of the long struggle of England against Spanish bigotry, faithlessness, and arrogance. Once more the "stars in their courses" seemed to "fight against" the oppressor of the nations. After English valour had done its best, the storm arose which swept the baffled fleet into the North Sea, whence only a few disabled hulks were destined to return. The fight for religious freedom has been a longer and yet more desperate one. In many countries it has not yet been achieved. It is a more arduous struggle in precisely the same proportion as the "children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light." But that the free development of individual opinion, rather than the voice of external authority, will be the means by which the Spirit of truth will ultimately lead Christ's disciples into all the truth, admits of little doubt. The πρῶτον ψεῦδος of the Roman and semi-Roman theories is that there exists an authority competent to decide, at any given moment, every controversy which is at that moment in existence. Such a theory is at variance with the fundamental idea of the Christian Church. That Church had power to define what the message was with which she was charged. But she never claimed the power of settling what deductions might fairly be drawn from its principles. External authority unquestionably has its place in all communities destined to occupy a place of any prominence in the world's

history. It is necessary to secure order, law, the coherence of the body politic. And as with nations, so with Churches. If they are not to be reduced to chaos by a process of disruption, there must be regulations, as well as persons whose business it is to enforce them, and periods during which it is necessary that they should be definitely ascertained and laid down. It is only when the principle of order and submission to lawful authority has taken a firm root, and when its nature and limits are clearly understood, that the principle of free and constitutional development can be allowed full play. It is here that the disciples of the Reformation have made their gravest mistakes. Like the Hollanders, who constantly began to argue with their commanders just as they were going into action against men long inured to discipline, the Reformers began to quarrel with one another at the outset of their combat *à outrance* with spiritual authority, backed by superstition and long prescription, and enforced by the sword of the civil magistrate. The Calvinist hated the Lutheran and the Arminian as much as, if not more than, he hated the Papist. What wonder if religious freedom found a home only among the stronger races, if the weaker ones made a poor fight against authority when they felt they were hopelessly divided among themselves? Moreover, unfortunately for itself, Protestantism, in its struggle for freedom, has consecrated the spirit of religious division. If men were not altogether satisfied with the regulations of the religious body to which they belong, they held themselves justified in forming another for themselves. And they have not been content to view secession as a necessary evil. In some quarters it has been ex-

tolled to the skies as the perfection of Christian liberty. So Rome, like Napoleon, has defeated, and continues to defeat, her antagonists in detail, and is able to preserve the imposing front which it cannot be denied that she still continues to present to the world even to the present hour.

Thus the struggle between Romanism and Protestantism has, from the moment of its commencement to the present hour, been a conflict between organised and unorganised effort. Rome commenced the conflict with every external advantage in her favour. Not only did the strongest civil governments ultimately range themselves on her side, but she had all the *prestige* attaching to long-standing supremacy. The shock of the Reformation compelled her to perfect her discipline, in order to meet more serious dangers than she had ever before been required to face. At the Council of Trent she succeeded in closing her ranks into a compact phalanx. The body of religious opinion which had grown up by degrees in the Church was crystallised into a system. Purgatory, the worship of the Virgin and the Saints, Sacramental grace, Justification, and other doctrines which had long been practically accepted, were carefully defined, and some extravagances on both sides were firmly repressed. It was felt, moreover, that some of the worst abuses prevalent in the Church must be put down, and the fact was recognised that even the most absolute ecclesiastical despotism could hardly, in the then condition of affairs, continue to exist without at least some regard for public opinion. Side by side with this careful and skilful consolidation of Church organisation, a body of men arose, whose special province it was to bring that organisation to bear on the

life of individuals and of nations. It is not too much to say that the very existence of the Roman Church during the last three centuries has been bound up with the activity of the Society of Jesus. Even their suppression is only the exception which proves the rule. The rare instinct the Roman communion displays in dealing with the difficulties which beset her, soon showed her that Rome without the Jesuits was as a warrior without arms or ammunition. Therefore the Order was re-established, and is probably the stronger for the mistakes in the seventeenth century which led to its temporary downfall. The existence of a body of defenders pledged to nothing but the establishment of a spiritual supremacy over the human mind, and ready to adopt any means whereby that spiritual supremacy can be gained and secured, is absolutely essential to the maintenance of a despotism such as that which is enshrined at the Vatican. It has lately been said of the leaders of the Jesuit body that they are absolutely destitute of religious convictions themselves, and only use religion as a means of obtaining supremacy over others. It may well be believed that this is so—that the man who is restrained by no religious scruples or prejudices of his own is best qualified for playing on the religious emotions of others. But, however this may be in the case of the present heads of his society, want of intense religious conviction certainly cannot be laid to the charge of the founder of the Order. Strange, even *bizarre*, his religious convictions may have been. His notions of morality on many points were not those of the religion of Christ. But it must be borne in mind that in religious, as in civil despotisms, fidelity to the

despot outweighs every other consideration whatsoever. If submission to constituted authority be the *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiæ*, then the end will naturally justify the means whereby obedience to that authority is enforced. Firmly convinced that fidelity to the Vicar of Jesus Christ, and to the rules and regulations of the body over which he ruled, was fidelity to Jesus Christ himself, Ignatius Loyola founded a society on the principle of loyalty to the Head of Christ's Church on earth, an object to which every other principle whatever must give way. Morality, no doubt, even the highest standard of morality, wherever possible; but wherever this came into conflict with the best interests of the Church, the ordinary rules of morality must be set aside. Accordingly Loyola and his followers set themselves, with the utmost energy, to set up permanently and irreversibly on earth that kingdom of which Gregory VII. and Innocent III. had dreamed, and were admirably seconded in their single-minded efforts by the self-will, the self-assertion, the contentious spirit of their adversaries. The pages of Ranke will tell us how they set about their task. They flung themselves, with the utmost energy and judgment, into the movement for secular education, and contrived for the most part to get it into their hands. They used the Confessional with extraordinary dexterity, and especially did they contrive to gain an influence over the female sex. Recognising the truths of the absolute supremacy of conscience on the one hand, and the imperfection of popular ideas of morality on the other, they skilfully adapted their principles to the spirit of the age. No standard of morality at all would have shocked the public conscience; a too exalted standard

would have provoked resistance. So in their books on casuistry they lowered their morality to the level of public opinion, and if they sowed the seeds of future disaster, they were at least rewarded by immediate success. They were acute enough also to see that absolutism was still the dominant principle in civil government. It was their policy to ally themselves with existing despotisms, to accommodate the religious system of Rome as far as possible to the wishes and prejudices of the civil ruler, and to point out to him the intimate connection of religious liberty with licence and insubordination in the State. By this means they gained an extraordinary influence in public affairs. Before very long they had the Latin races in Spain, in France, in Italy, in Belgium, at their feet. If the spirit of freedom was stronger in the Teutonic races, they at least won back Austria and half the rest of Germany; and if they could not regain Germany as a whole, yet by arraying Teuton against Teuton they could at least paralyse German influence in Europe, and had good reason for entertaining the hope that ultimately all Western Christendom would be won back to the Roman obedience.

To gain this end they used every weapon in their power—denunciation, calumny, intrigue, bribery, assassination, and above all, persecution. One can but make a passing allusion to the Spanish and Netherlandish Inquisition, to the vast number of lives that were sacrificed by their means, until the spirit of religious inquiry was absolutely crushed. The Jesuit morality of persecution was disturbed by no scruples. Those who ventured to think for themselves were "burned handsomely," as a Roman Catholic eye-wit-

ness puts it. Cities which would not expel the Reforming preachers were at once besieged. The doctrine that no faith need be kept with rebels and heretics was extremely to the taste of the tyrants of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; and again and again the articles of capitulation under which beleaguered cities were surrendered were most shamefully violated, and those whose lives the victors had solemnly promised to spare were butchered by hundreds in cold blood. The connection of such foul breaches of faith with ecclesiastical despotism is about as clearly proved as any fact of history can be. In the old heathen days, conditions of capitulation were, as a rule, strictly and faithfully kept. Heathen deities were supposed to hate and punish perfidy. Even when the barbarians swept down in their savagery upon the Roman empire, the breach of the pledged word was rare. It was not until submission to an earthly potentate had taken the place of obedience to the moral law that such breaches became common. As early as 1444 we hear of Cardinal Julian, the papal legate, proclaiming at the battle of Varna, that faith need not be kept with unbelievers; and report states that the Sultan Amurath called on Jesus, the Son of Mary, to avenge the treachery of His disciples. It is satisfactory to think that in this case, the first, so far as I remember, in which this unworthy doctrine was publicly proclaimed, its promulgation was rewarded by a disastrous defeat. Nevertheless, it continued to hold the field for more than two centuries, and even then it was necessity, not conviction, certainly not any recantation at the Vatican, which led to its abandonment. There are few students of history who do not sympathise with the Dutch in

their war of independence, when they were at last in a position to threaten reprisals on their perfidious and dishonest foes, and with William III., when after allowing Marshal Boufflers to depart, according to the terms of the capitulation of Namur, he afterwards re-arrested and detained him until he pledged his word that similar engagements, entered into with equal solemnity by his master, Louis XIV., should be observed with equal fidelity. It was everywhere the same. Violence, cruelty, perfidy—very seldom indeed reason, argument, persuasion—were the means by which countries were won back to the Roman yoke. English people have been persuaded to lavish a good deal of sentimental admiration on that interesting personage, St. François de Sales, whose gentleness, meekness, and persuasiveness, combined with a rare eloquence and logical power, we are asked to believe, restored the authority of the Roman Church in the neighbourhood of Geneva. The story is about on a level, in point of historic accuracy, with a mediæval legend. The hard, stern truth is, that François endeavoured for a considerable time to use such means as have been attributed to him in later times, and did not make a single convert ; and that then, despairing of making any impression on hearts so hardened as those of the Protestants of Annecy and the neighbourhood, he suggested more efficacious means to the Pope and the Duke of Savoy. Backed by a body of troops he took possession of the churches, and restored the mass in them, while the Duke of Savoy threatened imprisonment and confiscation of goods to those who refused to hear the Roman preachers. The Reformers and their adherents were deported to the frontiers, happy only in this,

that they were not required to seal their testimony with their blood.[1]

By such means were the Latin races and some Teutonic districts recovered to the Roman fold. The Thirty Years' War, the intervention of Sweden, and the ultimate peace of Westphalia, put a term to the conquests of the Papacy in Germany, and it is a remarkable fact that the religious settlement then arrived at has never been disturbed. Nor is this the only remarkable fact to be observed. Religious opinion has ultimately, in every case, followed the lead of the civil government. Where the government was inclined to the Papacy the population declared for the Pope. Where it favoured Reforming opinions, the people accepted them also ; and from that time to this, neither party has been able to win back the ground they have lost. This points, first of all, to religious exhaustion, which has rendered men weary of controversy ; next, to the divisions and mutual hatreds among the Reformers, which neutralised their efforts after freedom and truth ; and lastly, to the tendency among many of the nations which adhered to the Reformation to substitute a sentiment, a philosophy, a theological system, a bare spirit of inquiry and research, for the eternal principles of the "faith once delivered to the saints"—the historical religion preached by Apostles, recorded by Evangelists, and handed down in the creed of Christendom as the one unchanging deposit committed by Christ to the care of His Church.

At first, in France at least, some toleration was

[1] It is further said that the Saint offered a bribe to the heretic Beza, then resident in Switzerland, under the impression that the Reformer was capable of being approached by such a proposal, but that it met with the reception it deserved.

extended to the Reformers. Henry IV., though he thought the Crown of France well worth a mass, was not so unprincipled as to betray those who had so bravely fought for him. The Edict of Nantes protected the Protestants in the enjoyment of their belief. But the engagement was ill kept. The Huguenots may have been turbulent at times, but their opponents were unscrupulous and unmerciful. Savoy, then a state independent of France, continued to display a similar spirit. We are all of us acquainted with Milton's sonnet on the atrocities which disturbed the peace of the tranquil valleys in which the Vaudois had carried on their simple worship for centuries, and if, as we have been lately told, the effect of Cromwell's intervention has been exaggerated, there has been no exaggeration of the cruelties against which our great national poet protested. As time went on things went from bad to worse in the countries of the Latin race. The voice of religious freedom in Spain had long since been reduced to silence, and with it went the moral strength of the nation, whose history, from that day to this, has been one of moral and political, and, it might be added, religious corruption and decay. Italy was the battle-ground of the stranger, and it is a question whether the oppression of foreign races, of native princes, or of the States of the Church, was the worst. Ranke tells us how the dominions of the Pope were harassed by mal-administration and excessive taxation, and it is remarkable how, at the present moment, though in other parts of Europe it is the ignorant peasantry who form the chief support of the Papal cause, in the States of the Church it is the peasantry who hate the Pope most, so keen a sense

do they continue to entertain of the injustice and oppression to which they were exposed at the hands of his officials. As for France, she also steadily declined in prosperity and in her influence on Europe. Despotism, ambition, civil and religious oppression went hand in hand, and slowly and surely the moral and material life-blood of the nation was drained away. People in this age have unfortunately forgotten the cruel persecutions of the Protestants, the horrors of the Dragonnades, in comparison with which the recent Armenian atrocities would scarcely seem more shocking. It might be well that they should be forgotten, had it not also come to be more than half forgotten, that the principles of the Reformation alone delivered Europe from atrocities such as these. Had it not been for those principles, the fiendish outrages which the infallible head of the Church frequently encouraged, and never took the least trouble to repress or to denounce, would still, unless Protestantism had meanwhile been extirpated, have been going on, under the sanction of the so-called "Vicar" of the "Prince of Peace." The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 was a wanton and inexcusable infraction of a religious peace which had existed for a century, and it inflicted cruel losses and wrongs on the most industrious, the most peaceable, and not the least loyal of the subjects of the *Grand Monarque*. Our own national historian, Lord Macaulay, has sketched, with his usual inimitable clearness and point, the effect of this foolish as well as barbarous measure. It is a satisfaction to think that it not only turned out to be a source of national weakness and humiliation for France, but by substituting religious subjection for religious conviction, it

paved the way for that fierce revolt against the hierarchy which was one of the distinguishing characteristics of the French Revolution.

Nor were the Jesuits, who contrived to gain the upper hand in France as well as elsewhere, less resolute and less revengeful in extirpating the last lingering remnants of freedom of opinion in their own Church. Molinos was burned at Rome for believing that the soul should be passive in its reception of impulses from on high, rather than active in seeking them. Madame Guyon was rewarded for her expression of similar opinions by relentless persecution and a dungeon ; and the great, the good, the pious Fénélon, though he had been entrusted with the education of the Duke of Burgundy, son of Louis XIV., was involved in her disgrace.[1] The struggle of the Jesuits with Port Royal deserves more extended mention, since it has been the means, after a long interval, of inflicting the most serious blow the Church of Rome has sustained since the Reformation. In the earlier part of the seventeenth century there arose a great struggle between the followers of Augustine and the Jesuits. The former accused the latter of Pelagianism ; and Paul V., in 1607, had gone so far as to censure a work by the Jesuit Molina, published in Portugal in 1588, as Pelagian. The controversy waxed warm. After the death of Cornelius Janssen, Bishop of Yprès, in Belgium, his "Augustinus" was published. In this work he maintained with great ability

[1] La Combe, Madame Guyon's confessor, was also imprisoned on the plea that he had imparted these views to his penitent, and was kept in prison till he had lost his reason ! This was in the last decade of the seventeenth century, just when England was passing her Toleration Act. Cruel as the laws of the Restoration were against Nonconformists, they displayed no such ferocity as was shown in France to all who did not abjectly submit to the opinions of the sovereign.

the Pelagian tendency of the Jesuit teaching. The Jesuits, embittered by the influence Janssen's disciples were gaining in France, replied by procuring the condemnation of Janssen's book by Urban VIII. The Abbé St. Cyran, a friend of Janssen's, was at this time Director of the Convent at Port Royal, then presided over by the celebrated Mère Angelique, whose secular name was Marie Jacqueline Arnauld. Around these soon gathered a band of learned and able men, whose names have become well known to posterity: Arnauld d'Andilly, Antoine Arnauld, De Sacy, the translator of the Scriptures, Tillemont the historian, Quesnel, Nicole, and, greatest of them all, the immortal Pascal, whose "Provincial Letters" have thrown such light on the remarkable methods of reasoning to which the Jesuits were addicted. St. Cyran set himself to oppose the morality taught by the Jesuits in the Confessional. For this the Jesuits prevailed on Cardinal Richelieu to imprison him. He was released, but his health had suffered so much by his imprisonment that he soon died. Others of his party were treated with similar rigour. The intense sincerity and earnestness, however, of the Port Royalists, as they were now called, continued to attract attention, though it must be confessed that their high qualities were mingled with credulity, superstition, and an excessive and unreasonable asceticism. Neither argument nor intrigue, however, were sufficient to crush them.[1] The Jesuits, therefore, after an attempt to close Port Royal altogether, at length obtained a Papal Bull condemning

[1] It was reported that a bishop in the Jesuit interest, entering the refectory of a monastery as the reader was uttering the words, "For it is God that worketh in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure," angrily asked from what Jansenist book these heretical words were taken. Argument in such hands was not likely to be very successful.

five propositions which they asserted were extracted from Janssen's "Augustinus." The Port Royalists replied that the propositions were unquestionably false and worthy of condemnation, but that Janssen had never maintained them. The Jesuits, having complete influence over Louis XIV., who had taken the reins of power into his own hands on the death of Mazarin, obtained his sanction to the forcible closing of the whole establishment at Port Royal, which was regarded as the head-quarters of Janssen's party. The Port Royalists were driven into exile ; but three bishops in Holland, the Archbishop of Utrecht and the Bishops of Haarlem and Deventer, remained firm to Janssen's cause, and continued to maintain, in flat contradiction to the Pope, that Janssen had never affirmed the propositions it was sought to attribute to him. As they remained obstinate, the Papal excommunication was launched against them, not, be it observed, for heresy, but for disputing the Papal infallibility on a question, not of doctrine, but of fact. The small Jansenist, or more properly, Old Catholic Church of Holland, continued to exist, though in declining numbers, in spite of the papal excommunication. After much hesitation, during the course of which the succession to these Bishoprics had actually more than once died out, it was resolved to transmit it. And through the descendants of these protesting bishops, a valid Episcopal succession, according to the principles of canonicity acknowledged in the West, was transmitted to the present Old Catholic Bishops of Germany and Switzerland, and to the ecclesiastic recently consecrated to preside over the Independent Polish Catholic Church in the United States.

The policy of the Jesuits had thus been to crush out all independence of thought by measures of violence. They allied themselves with the despotisms of the day, and what they failed to secure by fair means, they contrived to obtain by force. The natural result followed. The stronger and more deeply earnest among the persecuted fled to foreign countries to find that liberty which was denied them at home. The weaker and less conscientious submitted to authority, and rendered an outward conformity to rites and doctrines which in their hearts they did not believe. Thus by degrees, in the nations which submitted to the Papacy, sober and rational religious conviction ceased to exist. In Spain the national energy died out, and with it enlightenment, religious and secular. Italy had no national life at all, but still lay, crushed and bleeding, in the hands of her oppressors. France and Austria alone were left to support the Roman Catholic interests in Europe. The latter, as a mere congeries of nationalities, was all along in the same perilous position in which we see her at the present moment. France, however, remained a predominant force in European politics. But the policy of Jesuitism was not long in displaying its natural results. The later years of Louis XIV. were years of humiliation and defeat. During the whole of the eighteenth century Roman Catholic France and Austria were on the decline, while Protestant England and Prussia were rapidly rising into pre-eminence, the latter in Europe, the former more especially in America and in Hindostan, from both of which she expelled the French by force of arms. The growth of indifferentism in France, the natural result, as has been said, of the religious policy of her monarch under the direction of

the Jesuits, filled the hearts of earnest men with deep forebodings, and historical critics have attributed to that policy, first the scepticism of Voltaire and the Encyclopædists, and afterwards the French Revolution. The cynical disregard of all moral principle on the part of the dominant classes in Church and State, coupled with the repressive measures which had destroyed intelligent religious opinion, and substituted for it fanaticism on the one hand, or a mere external conformity on the other, were the two factors which brought about the excesses at which the whole world stood aghast. It is true that the miserable failure of Jesuitism in the seventeenth century brought about the suppression of the Jesuits in the eighteenth. But it was soon found that the modern Papacy without the Jesuits was an impossibility. The Pope might do without them in the religious apathy which distinguished the early part of the eighteenth century; but the revival of religious energy necessitated an organisation devoted to Papal interests. The Jesuits were recalled into existence. As has already been remarked, they have learned wisdom by their former failure, and are the mainstay of the Roman system at the present moment.

The evils of religious despotism, however, are less clearly marked on the surface than those of civil oppression. There is much which tends to conceal from the superficial observer the real demoralisation which lurks beneath the Ultramontane appearance of piety. He sees that the churches are frequented; but he does not ask himself what are the nature of the influences which fill them, nor does he ask whether the moral and religious tone of the persons who thus throng to church is better than elsewhere. Religious societies are at

work, but it is not observed that they lie apart from the feelings of the nation at large. Spasmodic reactions there continually are, where Christianity is identified with Romanism. Such a reaction has lately been in progress in Spain and in France. It could not be otherwise. The religious sentiment is a necessity for the human heart. And in these countries no form of the religious idea has taken root, save that of the Roman Catholic Church. But these reactions do not last long. There is no permanent foundation of rational religious conviction to build upon. And so, when they have passed away, the conscience of the nation which has experienced them is more hardened than before. The "last state" of the penitent "is worse than the first." As with nations, so with individuals. The fear of death causes a man to send for the priest whom he has scorned all through his life. The need of religion for women and children is a creed to the man who has no other. And so he supports the priest against the religious reformer, and regards the latter as a pestilent disturber of the peace of society. Beside these occasional and short-lived reactions in Roman Catholic countries, it cannot be denied that everywhere the "dissidence of Dissent," the tendency, that is, which Protestantism has displayed towards infinite sub-division, has been a source of strength to Rome both before and since Bossuet's "Variations of Protestantism" saw the light. In one age such men as Charles II. and James II.,[1] in another, Frederick Schlegel, in another, Newman

[1] Whatever value may be attached to the opinions of our last two Stuart kings, it cannot be doubted that their conversion was the result of conviction, any more than, on the other hand, we can doubt that had they never joined the Church of Rome, they would have been better kings and better men.

and Manning, pass over from what Newman once called "the city of confusion and the house of bondage," into what they fondly presume to be a haven of security and peace. The Tractarian movement has undoubtedly strengthened the Roman communion in this country as much as it has strengthened our own. The Ultramontanes are never weary of predicting that it will ultimately bring about the submission of England to the Pope. And no doubt there is a constant "oozing over to Rome," to adopt an expression used to me years ago by one of the most able and original of the Tractarian clergy, from the extreme right among ourselves. Such considerations as these lead many to imagine that Rome is destined to regain the ground she has lost, and when skilfully urged, they are not unfrequently successful in inducing superficial reasoners to join her. But there is another side to the picture. The Church of Rome is by no means the happy family she is represented to outsiders as being. There has long been a restless dissatisfaction among the best and wisest of her members with things as they are, which must in the end produce its effect; and her secret history has long been one of perpetual bickerings and strife. As long as heretics could be burned and imprisoned, the task of "an insolent and aggressive faction," as Newman once termed the body which directs the movements of the Vatican, was easy enough. But it is by no means so easy, in these days of general toleration, to suppress opinion by weapons purely spiritual. From the days of Arnold of Brescia, of Savonarola, of Wyclif, of John Huss, and Jerome of Prague, to say nothing of the Reformation, there have been signs, within the pale of the Roman communion

itself, of dissatisfaction with her doctrine and discipline, and in the present century these signs have been extremely frequent. In France the recoil from the *Concordat* established by Napoleon with the Pope, led to a re-condescence of the old Jansenist and Gallican spirit. Thirty-six bishops refused to accept the *Concordat*, and died without having done so. Only, unlike the Old Catholics in Holland, they refused to perpetuate the schism. Yet the spirit remained, even when not only the bishops but the priests died out one by one ; and at the present moment it is reckoned that there are about 10,000 persons in various parts of France who refuse to attend Roman Catholic worship. They call themselves the *Petite Église*. They have neither priest nor church. But the works of the divines of Port Royal are handed down among them as the most precious treasures, and they remain to this day firm to the doctrines which the Jesuits imagined they had extirpated in the eighteenth century.[1] The Pope lately addressed an appeal to them to return to communion with the chair of St. Peter, but it fell upon deaf ears. Some of them have asked for religious privileges from the Old Catholic congregation at Paris, which is practically a mission from the Old Catholic Church in Holland, itself the ecclesiastical heir of Janssen and the Port Royalists. Others still remain "as sheep without a shepherd." In Germany, too, the spirit of discontent has found expression. The celebrated Hirscher, better known than at present to us English some two generations back, through the translation of his work under the title "Sympathies of the Continent," by the late Bishop Cleveland Coxe, strove,

[1] M. Léon Séché has lately written an account of this most interesting community.

in the early part of the present century, to press reform upon his ecclesiastical superiors. He defended the abolition of the rule of celibacy for the clergy, recommended that the services of the Church should be conducted in the vernacular, and pleaded for the reform of sundry abuses connected with indulgences, confession, and the worship of the Virgin and the Saints.[1] Sailer, too, afterwards Bishop of Ratisbon, advocated the reforms which the Old Catholics afterwards carried out, after their final separation from the Pope.

The story of Wessemburg, Coadjutor-Bishop of Constance, deserves, perhaps, to be told at greater length. He was chosen as coadjutor to the celebrated Dalbey in 1802, in consequence of his having recommended himself to the Vatican, as well as to Dalbey himself, by his successful discharge of a mission to Switzerland, with which he had been entrusted. His delegated authority extended over parts of Switzerland, as well as of the Grand Duchy of Baden. As soon as he entered upon his duties he laboured might and main for a reform in the condition of the clergy and the Church. He found the clergy uneducated and unfitted for their office, a defect which he strove at once to remedy. He reformed the Theological Seminary, and strove to improve the education the candidates for Orders received before they entered it. He endeavoured to introduce services in the vernacular and the knowledge of the Bible, as well as to improve the musical portion of the Church services. He next laboured to impart a more democratic character to the Church

[1] A full account of Hirscher as a theologian and reformer, by Dr. Lauchert, will be found in the *Revue Internationale de Théologie*, Oct. 1894, April and Oct. 1895, and Jan. 1896. He was a voluminous writer himself, and the subject of many biographical and theological writings.

organisation in the diocese. He advocated self-government in the place of government from Rome, as well as the right of the laity to be consulted in the management of Church affairs, and in the choice of their pastors. This brought the long-suppressed indignation of the Jesuit party to a head. On the death of Dalbey, in 1817, Wessemburg was chosen by the Chapter of Constance to succeed him. The Vatican replied by requesting that a man of better report should be chosen. Wessemburg, in spite of the remonstrances of his friends, set off to Rome to plead his own cause, and tedious and protracted were the arguments and intrigues which followed. His Roman experiences, like those of Lamennais after him, have been made familiar to us of late in the pages of Zola's "Rome." Wessemburg, like others, found it impossible to make any impression on the Pope and his *entourage*. Submission, and submission only, was the course required of him. After six months he left Rome, saying "I breathe more freely now I have escaped from that atmosphere."[1] "The unconditional power of the Pope," said Wessemburg of the "Römlingseele," "is their idol." The Pope steadily refused to allow him to become Bishop of Constance; and when, after some negotiations, the seat of the Bishopric was transferred to Freiburg, the Vaticanists contrived to induce the Grand Duke Ludwig to nominate some one else in Wessemburg's place. The story of Wessemburg's life is narrated in glowing terms by Dr. Beck, a member of the Council of the Duchy of Baden, who calls him the courageous pioneer and worthy leader of

[1] Some may be reminded by this of Dr. Newman's memorable observation, when the intrigues against him at Rome were at their height, and when it was reported that he was about to repair thither, that "the atmosphere of Rome did not agree with his constitution."

the reform party of the Catholic confession among his people. He survived till 1860, and after nearly forty years his memory is still held in honour. A Swiss friend of my own, who, while he lived, was among the most energetic and enlightened of the old Catholic laity, but who has lately, alas! been taken from us,[1] told me, how in 1863, seven years before the Vatican Council, his first act, when he went as a young gymnasiast to Constance, was to go to the Cathedral and visit Wessemburg's grave. "So highly," he added, "was the character of this man honoured in the non-Ultramontane circles of the Catholic Church."

At a still later period, Leopold Schmidt, formally elected to the Bishopric of Mainz in 1849, an era of storm and revolution in Europe, was opposed by the Jesuits for his supposed Protestantising tendencies. They procured his rejection from the Pope, and induced the Pope to nominate the well-known Von Ketteler in his place. Their intrigues drove Schmidt, mild, gentle, and inoffensive as had been his life, to renounce communion with the Roman Church as intolerant and Ultramontane; while he still maintained that he was not a Protestant, but a Catholic. Augustin Theiner, again, the Librarian of the Vatican, held his post amid ever increasing misgivings. His book on Clement XIV., the suppressor of the Jesuits, was put at once on the Index. His work on the Council of Trent was stopped. At last, in 1870, he was turned out of his office on account of his persistent opposition to the Vatican decrees.[2]

[1] Dr. Weibel.

[2] Since the Vatican Council Professor Reusch, one of the Reforming Party, in his *Die Deutschen Bischöfe and der Aberglaube*, has called attention to the increase of superstitions connected with Purgatory, the use of scapulars

In Italy the same reforming spirit showed itself, though amid great dangers and difficulties. The celebrated Rosmini, a philosophical theologian of high repute in the Roman communion, published, in 1849, a work called the "Five Wounds of the Church,"[1] in which he boldly and honestly laid bare the evils which afflicted the communion to which he belonged. The Jesuits laboured hard to obtain a condemnation of this book, but only partially succeeded, and Rosmini died in the communion of the Church he had in vain endeavoured to reform. Gioberti, about thirty years previously, had written a treatise on "Catholic Reform in the Church." But this simply consisted in his recommendation of a more philosophical system of Church teaching, in which the sharp angles of dogma were to be rubbed off, and an exaggerated asceticism toned down. The case of Father Passaglia also deserves notice. The hero of the proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin in 1854, he was the principal figure in a picture painted to commemorate that event. But as he afterwards put himself at the head of 9000 priests who protested against the temporal power of the Pope, he fell into disgrace, and his likeness was removed from the picture in which it had occupied the most prominent place. Monsignore Tiboni, Canon of Brescia, about the same time advocated the translation and free reading of the Scriptures, services in the vernacular, the Holy Communion in both kinds, confession made

and blessed wonder-working medals, and has appealed to the Roman bishops to put a stop to it, but of course in vain.

[1] The five wounds of the Church are—1. Worship in an unknown tongue; 2. The ignorance of the clergy; 3. The despotism of the bishops; 4. The appointing of bishops by the State; 5. The State control of Church property.

voluntary, and the abolition of enforced clerical celibacy, as well as the abolition of the autocracy of the Pope. Audisio was another priest of reforming sentiments, and cautious as was his avowal of them, he did not escape the usual denunciation, from the consequences of which he freed himself by declaring that he had never said, nor wished to say, anything contrary to the authority of the Pope and the Church. When Count Campello actually seceded from the Roman Church in 1881 in order to devote himself to the unfettered prosecution of the work of reform, Audisio, while wishing him God speed, excused himself from following him on the ground of his age. The two most prominent opponents, however, of the Vatican in late years were Cardinal d'Andrea and Padre Curci. The former placed himself at the head of the movement for an Italian Catholic Reformed Church in Southern Italy, and was followed by three hundred priests. After some controversy, d'Andrea, contrary to the advice of his friends, accepted an invitation from the Vatican to discuss the question with the Pope. This was in May 1866. Immediately afterwards he died so suddenly that Cardinal Antonelli was compelled to acquiesce in a *post-mortem* investigation. No cause of death was assigned, but the immediate realisation of the forebodings of his friends has been held by many unprejudiced persons to justify the suspicion that he was poisoned.[1] Baron Ricasoli, the Italian Prime Minister at that juncture, not seeing the importance of the movement which d'Andrea had inaugurated, delivered the three hundred priests into

[1] Dr. Beck, in his *Freiherr Heinrich von Wessemburg, Sein Leben und Wirken*, p. 277, says of Wessemburg's journey to Rome in 1817, "Viele fürchteten—und bei dem tödtlichen Hass der Partei, und der damaligen Zeitlage, nicht ganz ohne Grund—für die persönliche Sicherheit des Freundes."

the hands of their bishops. They were one by one starved into submission, and thus ended a bold and promising attempt at Reform in the Italian Church. Curci's case is also remarkable. Himself a Jesuit, he became discontented with the policy of his order. In two powerful books, *La Nuova Italia ed i Vecchi Zelanti*, and *Il Vaticano Regio*, the first published in 1881, the second shortly afterwards, he painted in strong terms the miserable condition of his communion in Italy, the fanaticism, the intrigue, the party spirit at work in it, the ignorance and worthlessness of the great majority of the clergy, and especially the neglect of the study of Holy Scripture, a neglect he strove to remedy by publishing a Commentary on the Bible. But his works were speedily condemned; the Jesuits laboured incessantly to effect his overthrow, and, after a noble and vigorous resistance, the old man (Curci was over seventy) was effectually starved out and silenced.

If we turn once more to France, the same spectacle awaits us. I have already referred to the history of the *Petite Église*. I proceed to further manifestations of the same spirit. Like Grosseteste in the thirteenth century, Lamennais in the nineteenth commenced his career as a devout believer in the Papacy. As in Grosseteste's case, the severe logic of facts compelled Lamennais to change his mind. In his *Essai sur l'Indifférence en matière de Religion*, he gave the warmest expression to his earlier belief. Pursued by Jesuit opposition, by jealousy and intrigue, as he strove to develop a policy which he believed would reconcile his Church and nation, he found his idol shattered in his grasp. In vain did he go to Rome and appeal to the Pope (Gregory XVI.) personally. In his last interview the

wily Italian, so Spüller tells us, did but enlarge on the talents of Michael Angelo, and offer the enthusiastic reformer a box of *lapis lazuli*, containing some of the Pope's best snuff. Disgusted with the idol he had once adored, in his *Paroles d'un Croyant* he gave vent to his disappointment and despair. Together with Montalembert and Lacordaire, whose youthful enthusiasm, like that of Lamennais, had seen in the Roman Catholic Church, with the Pope at its head, the only hope of regenerating society, he started *L'Avenir*, a journal devoted to the interests of religion. But in the Encyclical *Mirari Vos* the principles advocated in this journal were condemned. Its issue was suspended. Lamennais retired into silence, solitude, and as his enemies asserted, into scepticism. His comrades in the work ended their lives under a more or less thick cloud of censure and reproach. And so pilgrimages to Lourdes and the like take the place of rational religion, new *cults* supplant the worship of God, the clergy grow more ignorant and fanatical, and in many villages the Church is unable to supply any clergy at all.[1]

The Roman Church then, in various lands, has long presented the aspect of a sea which, though smooth apparently on the surface, is heaving and struggling beneath that surface with the ground-swell of suppressed emotions. The ablest spirits of the ruling faction within her pale were not insensible of the dangers which environed her. And they jumped to the conclusion that the best way to repress rebellion within, and to confound their enemies

[1] These facts are vouched for by the Abbé Bougaud in a work called *Le Grand Peril de l'Église de France.* Mgr. Dupanloup, Archbishop of Lyons, also published a pamphlet in 1876, entitled *Ou allons nous*, speaking of the unsatisfactory state of things among the laity.

without, was to put the capstone on the monarchical system of the Church by the proclamation of Papal infallibility. Of this policy Manning was the most persistent and determined supporter. He believed he saw in it a weapon with which recalcitrants within could instantly be crushed, and a means by which those without who were wont to taunt their Roman Catholic antagonists with having indeed an infallible Church, but as being unable to define where the infallibility resided, could effectually be silenced. The risks were unquestionably great. The opposition was bold, numerous, and intelligent, even among the bishops who were present at the Council, and the three Munich Professors, Döllinger, Huber, and Friedrich, supported by a host of other learned men in Germany and elsewhere, had organised a most formidable resistance. On this, however, as on other occasions, courage and determination triumphed over all obstacles. The policy of the promoters of the Council was resolutely and not too scrupulously carried out. One by one the protesting bishops gave in their submission, and at length all fear of an organised Episcopal revolt was at an end. The rebellious German and Swiss Professors were excommunicated, and the establishment of a Papal monarchy over the Roman Church was a *fait accompli*.

The success of Manning and his party, however, though almost beyond expectation, was not quite complete. A movement, which, though small in its beginnings, has been already not unfruitful in results, was initiated in opposition to the sentence of the Council. The ferment, which at first was great, rapidly subsided, and those who finally determined on an organised resistance to the new ecclesiastical despotism

were few indeed. Döllinger himself, though he could not bring himself to discountenance this resistance, did not feel at liberty to give it his active support. Nevertheless the small band of resolute opponents, headed by Reinkens, Reusch, and Von Schulte, determined to proceed. The bishops of the Old Catholic Church of Holland, the history of which has been narrated above, offered to consecrate a bishop, and Reinkens was ultimately consecrated to the charge of some fifty thousand souls in Germany, who were resolved as Catholics to have religious privileges for themselves and their families. The Papal excommunication, it should be understood, involved the denial of all Church rites to those who came under its ban. Reinkens consecrated Herzog to preside over about the same number of dissidents in Switzerland. Thus was what is known as the Old Catholic movement inaugurated — the first attempt since the Reformation at organised resistance to Rome. Among the fickle and volatile French Old Catholicism never took any root. In spite of the strenuous exertions of M. Hyacinthe Loyson, one congregation only, at Paris, has been brought into existence to maintain Old Catholic principles. It is now under the supervision of the Old Catholic bishops of Holland. In Austria, on the contrary, the movement has made rapid and increasing progress,[1] and is only prevented by the intolerance of the Austrian Government from having a bishop of its own. In Italy, Count Campello, once Canon of St. Peter's at Rome, has been struggling manfully since 1881, and not altogether unsuccessfully, to form an Italian Catholic Church, and Professor Miraglia, who has lately initiated an independent movement of his own at

[1] Especially during the present year (1899).

Piacenza, has also, towards the close of the year 1897, announced his accession to the Old Catholic body.[1] The consecration of a sixth Old Catholic bishop for an Independent Church of the Poles in America, at the beginning of this year, has extended the movement as far as the United States. The immediate result of the formation of Old Catholic communities was the carrying out, as far as their members were concerned, of the reforms which earnest men in the Roman Catholic communities had so long desired. The Old Catholic Churches lost no time in repudiating the decrees of a purely Western Council such as Trent, and recurred to the voice of the undivided Church. The prayers were said in the vernacular; the free reading of the Bible was permitted; confession was made optional; the voice of the laity forced on a somewhat reluctant clergy the permission of marriage to the members of the clerical order, and the modern cults, the excessive veneration paid to the Virgin, and the abuses connected with private masses, purgatory, and indulgences were done away with. The election of priests by their congregations, and the free participation of the laity in Church Government, are among the most prominent features of the system, and it is on the intelligent co-operation of its laity that the Old Catholic cause mainly reposes. Of course, too, the *incubus* of the *Index* has been removed, and the clergy permitted freely to speak their mind on all points not formally decided by the Universal Church. It is yet too early to estimate the effect such a bold step as the Old Catholics have taken is likely to produce. The number of those who dared

[1] Protestantism, some years ago, under the eloquent Gavazzi, made much progress. But it has lost much ground since by its internal and external dissensions.

adopt an attitude so unprecedented as that of resistance to the Head of the Church was no doubt at first almost infinitesimal. But, small as it was, neither persecution, abuse, bribery, social or political pressure, nor persuasion—and all have been freely and unscrupulously used by the Ultramontanes—have availed to put the Old Catholics down. They have survived the indifference, the jealousy, the hostility of Romanism, of Protestantism, and of the civil government alike. They have faced the difficulties of organisation, and these were considerable; but their publications are slowly and surely leavening the mind of Europe; no fear of the *Index* disturbs their freedom of speech; and their Churches are making steady, if slow progress. Their negotiations for union with the Orthodox Churches of the East are considerably advanced. Their relations with the Anglican communion would be most cordial if it were possible to induce Anglicans to take the slightest interest in them. Even now Anglicans are freely admitted to communion in their Churches. As to their protest against Rome, it cannot be silenced, as the previous movements already recorded have been silenced. Weekly in their pulpits, and in their organs in the press, is that protest being made, and it is steadily increasing in volume and in effect. The continual affirmation of the fact that Vaticanism is not Catholicism, but the most grotesque perversion imaginable of Catholicism, cannot possibly be without result. But perhaps the greatest service Old Catholicism is rendering to Christendom, and the most serious injury it is inflicting on the Church of Rome, is the policy which has instituted Reunion Conferences, to which all Christians are freely invited, and to which all but Roman Catholics and extreme

Protestants freely resort, and which has established the *Revue Internationale de Théologie*, in which all competent persons desirous of reunion are invited freely to discuss the points of difference between the various Churches.[1]

Englishmen may be inclined to wonder at the smallness of the results obtained so far by the Old Catholics. Those who are well acquainted with the Roman Catholic Church will be inclined to wonder that they are not smaller. The condition of helplessness and indifference to which the Roman Catholic system has reduced most men who outwardly conform to that Church, can scarcely be imagined by an outsider. Lamennais, in 1837, had prophesied the birth of such a movement, and he added the following remarkable words: "It will be at first like a point one hardly perceives, a small aggregation at which possibly people will laugh. But that point will expand, that aggregation will spread. From all parts people will flow to it, because it will be a refuge to all who suffer." A French Abbé, writing on Old Catholicism in the *Revue Internationale de Théologie* for January 1898, speaks of the "indifference of the *esprits blasés* by Popery and Voltairianism." He adds, and he is not alone in adding, "Mais il finira par triompher." It is at least the only body on the Continent which retains the organisation on which Roman Catholics set such store.

Thus a general view of the relative positions of the Roman Catholic body and other communions displays the former as gradually, though very slowly, losing ground. Where Rome was able to make use of despotic authority to crush freedom of thought, for the

[1] This serial admits articles in French, German, and English.

time she bore down all opposition. But since she lost the support of the civil government, her task has become immeasurably harder. First and foremost, the control of education has slipped from her hands.[1] Then the influence of the nations which lent themselves to her policy has steadily declined in Europe, while those which adopted the principles of the Reformation have as steadily advanced to supremacy. France, the country on which her system had a hold for the shortest time, shook herself fiercely free from Roman domination at the Revolution, and has never in reality been a "Catholic," scarcely even a Christian nation since. Nor is Rome able to maintain her hold, even on her own adherents. In Germany the Lutheran Church steadily gains on her Roman antagonist. Within the last few months thirty priests have left the Roman Catholic Church in France, including the Abbé Charbonnel and the Abbé Philippot, men of mark in their communion, and the Abbé Bourrier, the leader of the movement, has established a journal, *Le Chrétien Français*, to record its progress.[2] Italy, by her adherence to the House of Savoy, and her determination to become once more a country, is at daggers drawn with the Vatican, and derives what national spirit she has from that very fact. Spain and Portugal have ceased to be of any account in the councils of nations. Their dominions have been dismembered already, and the former has just been dismembered once more. Austria

[1] Theiner, the Librarian of the Vatican mentioned above, writes to Döllinger in a letter, dated April 28, 1867, "The Protestants are the sole masters in this field [education]. And this because the Jesuits were in exclusive possession of education, and crammed us only with their wretched dog Latin, so that we understood neither Latin nor German."

[2] The effect of the Dreyfus case has been largely to increase M. Bourrier's following.

engaged in a duel with Prussia for the hegemony of Germany, and was signally worsted in the conflict. The Vatican did its best to stir up strife between France, at that time under Roman Catholic influences, and Prussia, a Protestant kingdom, whose progress as such the Vatican feared, and was resolved if possible to prevent. The struggle took place, France was hopelessly worsted, and William I., the Protestant King of Prussia, became Emperor of Germany.[1] Thus Vatican intrigues succeeded in placing the ascendency in Germany in the very hands from which it had hoped to wrest them. If we confine our glance to Europe, we find no Roman Catholic power holding a commanding position. Austria seems almost on the point of dissolution. France is rather an infidel than a Christian country. Germany on the whole is Protestant, Russia Orthodox. In the British Isles, the Roman Catholics, at the beginning of the century about one-fourth, are now not more than a seventh of the population. If we endeavour to forecast the probable future of the world, three powers stand out above all others as the great powers of the future. They are England, Russia, and the United States. None of these profess any allegiance to the Holy See. Nor, in spite of the able and almost superhuman efforts of the Vatican to extend, or at least to retain, its influence, do those efforts seem to produce much result. It has always been its policy to obtain temporal supremacy, and a promising Mission came to nought in Japan, chiefly because the missionaries followed the vicious Roman

[1] M. Hoffet, in an article in the *Revue Internationale de Théologie*, April 1898, p. 403, remarks on the unification of German Protestantism brought about by the unification of Germany.

custom of interfering in the civil politics of the country. In the effort to obtain a tangible authority, instead of simply endeavouring to leaven religious thought, it has in various countries allied itself with influences the most antagonistic. Imperialism or Legitimism in France, Socialism and Republicanism in Ireland, Carlism in Spain, have been employed to strengthen Papal influence, and to obtain supremacy in the United States, the "Catholic elector" has not scrupled to enter into close relations with the notorious Tammany Hall. The loss of the temporal power, which the Papacy struggled so desperately to retain, has proved an advantage in carrying out this policy, because the Vatican has been able to give its undivided attention to it, unhampered by the cares and political entanglements of civil government. Another advantage of which it avails itself to the utmost in Roman Catholic countries is the recent wide extension of the suffrage throughout Europe. Political power is placed thereby in the hands of the most ignorant classes. It is precisely these over which Rome has the most control. Consequently, in Roman Catholic countries there are continual clerical reactions of a very dangerous kind. To promote these reactions, the Vaticanists do not scruple to resort to the most unscrupulous tactics. This very year the question of the acquisition of the Swiss railways by the State has been taken up by the Roman Catholic Church for her own purposes. Railways promote the circulation of intelligent opinion ; therefore the increase of railways in Switzerland is eminently undesirable in the eyes of the Vatican faction, and the most ignorant and backward of the Swiss cantons voted solid against the proposition, though it was supported by all the cantons,

Roman Catholic or Protestant, where intelligence and manufacturing industries are to be found. Where Protestantism is strong, the Vatican puts forward its fairest and most liberal aspect, poses as the friend of social order and the rights of capital, and endeavours to secure Conservative support against the dangerous tendencies of modern Liberalism. In dealing with the infidel Socialist, the Roman Catholic Church makes capital of the very strongly-pronounced indifferentism of many of her supporters ; and a Socialist lately informed an Old Catholic candidate for the representation of Lucerne in the Swiss Federal Assembly, that he should prefer to vote for the Roman Catholic candidate, assigning as his reason that in voting for a Roman Catholic he would be voting for a man with no definite religious convictions, whereas in voting for an Old Catholic he would be doing the very opposite. Yet where Rome has a free hand, all the old fierce intolerance breaks out, as fierce as in the days when the Church had the stake and the gibbet at her command.

Thus, spite of all this skilful manipulation of policy to suit the particular occasion, the Vatican seems to be making very little, if any, progress. Clerical reactions are followed by Liberal reactions. The most remarkable of these, though by no means the only one, is the extraordinary revulsion of feeling in Canada last year in regard to the Manitoba schools question, which placed Mr. Laurier, a Liberal Roman Catholic, in power. A serious opposition, headed by Archbishop Ireland, and supported by theologians of note, against the government of the Roman Catholic Church from the Vatican, and in favour of Home Rule, has lately broken out in the United States, and it has taxed all the

resources of the Vatican, which has been compelled to give way to it.[1] The consecration by the Old Catholics last year of Herr Anton Kozlowski, to preside over 30,000 members of the "Polish Independent Catholic Church," is a further illustration of the progress in America of the movement for ecclesiastical Home Rule. The Roman Church, in fact, is environed on all sides by difficulties and dangers, and well may Papal allocutions be full of complaints and lamentations. She reminds us at the present moment of those conjurors who, with inimitable dexterity, balance themselves upon a pole. We admire the dexterity; but we do not fail to perceive that a moment's giddiness, a moment's forgetfulness, might lead to very disastrous results. Moreover, it is as dangerous now as it was in the days of Bishop Pecock to try to defend her system by argument. The simple assertion of authority is felt to be far easier, and far more consistent. Accordingly, the able writers and orators who arise from time to time to maintain the cause of Rome, are seen, one by one, to "go down into silence." Lamennais was condemned, was driven from the Roman communion, and refused to see a priest before he died. Lacordaire died out of favour with the authorities of his Church. Montalembert's last moments were clouded by opposition and suspicion. That splendid living orator and thinker, Père Hyacinthe, whom the age has hardly appreciated as he deserves, was in difficulties with

[1] At one time Archbishop Ireland was in disgrace, and his supporter Dr. Keane was removed from the headship of his Seminary at Washington. Now Archbishop Ireland is in high favour, and Dr. Keane is preaching at Rome and giving general satisfaction. At least, so says the *Gazette de Lausanne* of February 28, 1898. Since this note was written, however, the Pope has condemned Archbishop Ireland and his followers.

his ecclesiastical superiors before the decrees of the Vatican Council compelled him to brave the excommunication pronounced against those who reject them. Père Didon, another great French preacher, was ordered to retire and meditate on his rash utterances in the seclusion of his convent. Padre Agostino di Montefeltro, who rather more than ten years ago was drawing vast crowds to the churches of Italy, and whose addresses were sold at every newspaper stall in the country, was compelled to read his recantation in the pulpit, his voice choked with tears ; and from 1889 to the present moment, nothing more has been heard of him. In short, Vaticanism at the present day must be described as an organisation which is determined, if possible, to wield unlimited power over the hearts and consciences of men, by the negation of reason and the suppression of inconvenient facts.

In the foregoing observations it is frankly admitted that only the unfavourable side of the Roman system has been presented to the reader. It is not for a moment denied that there is another, and a better. It could hardly be otherwise as long as Christ on His Cross remains the prominent figure in Roman Catholic Churches. There is an incalculable amount of the deepest self-devotion, the most ardent zeal, the most exquisite purity of heart and life, the most unbounded meekness, humility, and submission in the Roman communion ; and it must be admitted that these qualities are, to a very considerable extent, a consequence of her system. Such qualities are an untold source of moral strength, and without them she would barely have been able to outlast the century. As

Carlyle once said, Romanism unquestionably has a *raison d'être*, and not until she ceases to have one can she cease to exist. It cannot be denied that for the ignorant, for women, for men of meek and submissive temperament, for men who are worn out by intellectual conflicts, the Roman Catholic Church presents herself as a haven of peace, a calm and restful authority which stills the struggles of the rebellious heart. But certainly at the present moment it has once more become necessary to remind men that there is a reverse to the medal, another side to the picture.[1] The recoil towards Rome from the vulgar Protestantism of half a century back, reinforced as it is by a spurious Liberalism and a still more spurious charity, compels us once more to call attention to the fact that there is a "seamy side" to Romanism as a religious system. The ignorant, the commonplace, the submissive, the meek and lowly, the wearied and exhausted are not the only members of a church which numbers a Peter and a Paul, an Athanasius, a Jerome, and a Bernard, to name no other name, among her saints. It has become necessary once more to insist, and to insist strongly, that freedom of thought, freedom of opinion, freedom of discussion, are the inalienable privileges of mankind. If freedom, as it often does, degenerates into licence, authority not unfrequently slides into tyranny, and tyranny is everywhere a blighting curse.[2] A combination of circumstances has of

[1] These words were written before the revelations of the Dreyfus case startled all honest men, Roman Catholic as well as Protestant. Many who would have disputed their justice when they were written would admit it now.

[2] "Disunion comes from rebellion, and rebellion comes from tyranny, and tyranny is only the exaggeration of authority pushed to excess" (Duggan, "Steps towards Reunion," p. 77). "Rebellion comes from too much ruling, blind obedience makes blind subjects; blind subjects make blind rulers, and

late tended to obscure our English apprehension of the evils of an ecclesiastical despotism, its injustice, its intrigues,[1] its favouritism, its suppression, whenever possible, of inconvenient facts. We have had our eyes too exclusively fixed on our own shortcomings, our attention too unfrequently directed to the far graver evils produced by a system the very opposite of our own. Men forget, moreover, that Rome, in spite of her manifold shortcomings in every respect, professes to be under infallible guidance, whereas at most we do not pretend to do more than feel our way from good to better. Many of us, appalled by the spectacle of our own intestine divisions, have come to look upon schism as the one unpardonable sin, forgetting that there is at least one thing more precious than the preservation of an external unity—and that one thing is truth. At a moment such as this, a restatement of the main principles of the Reformation has become a paramount necessity. At the Reformation there was no intention of questioning the fundamental truths of the Christian religion. All that was contended for was, that those principles once admitted, the fullest liberty should be conceded of discussing and elaborating them, of applying them, and of drawing conclusions from them. Christians are pledged neither to the opinions of Luther, Calvin, nor Zwingli, of Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer, nor, we may even venture to add, of Origen, Athanasius, or Augustine. We venerate all these men;

we know what happens when the blind lead the blind" (Ibid., p. 108). Cardinal Vaughan has found it his duty to delate this work, written by a Roman Catholic priest, to the Holy See as "offensive to pious ears, temerarious, and scandalous."

[1] "Cardinal Manning's Life," by Mr. Purcell, shows to what courses an educated Englishman could descend, as, for instance, in the Errington case, when entangled in the meshes of the Vaticanist system.

we believe that the Holy Ghost has spoken by each and all of them in their measure. But the Christian conscience recognises none of them as infallible. It attributes infallibility to nothing but the teaching of Christ, as preserved in the Scriptures, and handed down in and by the Universal Church. It claims to be left unfettered, save by those elementary principles. It asks to be allowed to "prove all things," as well as to "hold fast that which is good." It declines to "teach for doctrines the commandments of men." It draws no artificial or exaggerated distinctions between the governors and the governed in Christ's Church, believing that "the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal," and that the "unction from the Holy One," which enables us to "know all things," is not the exclusive possession of any class or order within her pale. Upon the fact that each one of us hath been "made to drink" into "a free Spirit" it is content to rest. And it hopes, day by day, and step by step, in reliance on that Spirit's indwelling in the Church, to draw ever nearer to the hour when it shall have been guided by the same Spirit "into all the truth."

CHAPTER XIII

ENGLISH CHRISTIANITY TO-DAY

By the Right Rev. ALFRED BARRY, D.D.

In the order of thought suggested in these Essays, "the English Christianity of to-day" must be considered, both in itself, and in respect of the contribution which it has to make to the present and future life of the whole Church of Christ. It is clear that this consideration of it must take account, not merely of those essentials of Christianity, in which all Christians and all Churches are one, but of the peculiar characteristics which have been so stamped upon it in the course of its history, as to give it at this moment a certain tone and power of its own. Now the "English Christianity of to-day" is the outcome of a continuous growth from the whole English Christianity of the past, but especially since the great epoch of the Reformation. For at that time it had to take up a position of decided, though not unlimited, independence; while declaring emphatically that it "intended not to decline or vary from the congregation of Christ's Church in things concerning the Catholic faith of Christendom, or declared in Holy Scripture and the Word of God to be necessary to salvation." It is the combination of the attachment to Catholic unity here claimed, with the independence of a free development of its own especial character, which has always constituted the peculiarity

of English Christianity, and determined its function as a factor in the common growth of the Kingdom of Christ itself. But our own age has brought out that function with a new clearness and vividness, because (as will be noticed more fully hereafter) it is a period of expansion of that Christianity, both in fact and in idea, losing insularity in the conception and realization of a world-wide mission.

I ought to say at the outset that, in this attempt to estimate it, I must be in the main content to refer to English Christianity as it is represented in the Church of England. I do so, not only with a view to limit a subject of formidable extent, and to consider it in a field of which we Churchmen have the fullest knowledge, but also, because—while I do not for a moment ignore the strength and vitality of Nonconformist Christianity, in England itself and (still more) among the English-speaking race in other parts of the world—I cannot but see that the Church of England, as the old National Church, is necessarily most truly representative of the characteristics of English Christianity, as a whole—not only in the present, but in the past—not in some classes, but in all classes of our people. It is, of course, itself affected by the reflex action upon it of other religious Communions — each of which tends to emphasize, prominently, sometimes almost exclusively, some one element of its own complex life. But it maintains still the comprehensiveness of its representative character. Although the old condition of things has passed away, in which the Church was looked upon as co-extensive with the nation—as in fact the nation itself in its spiritual life—it has left behind this representative character as an inheritance from the past. More-

over, the Church of England by its very nature stands, not only as the Nonconformist Communions stand, for Christian truth, but for Christian unity, which Nonconformity, as such, disregards, though it is remarkable that some Nonconformist Communions are now beginning to make tentative approaches to it. If therefore English Christianity, as such, is to have any collective mission of service to the whole Church of Christ, it seems overwhelmingly probable, if not absolutely certain, that it will have to discharge that mission mainly through the Church of England.

I. Now it is clear that the peculiar character of our English Christianity is determined by the very fact that it is English—that it is indeed the leading factor in the remarkable function, which undoubtedly belongs to the English-speaking race, in regard to the progress of humanity. For its main principle—distinctly asserted at the Reformation, but not as a new thing—is the realization in the spiritual sphere of what has been the distinguishing feature of the whole national life of England. This is unquestionably the resolute maintenance of a harmony of individuality with unity, of freedom with authority—a harmony necessarily difficult and imperfect, involving many irregularities and anomalies, which are the scorn of the adherents of narrower systems, but accordant with our human nature, which is at once individual and social, and with the Divine Government, which, Almighty as it is, nevertheless works upon men, and through men, as free. It is an ideal, which has been to a great extent realized in the lower spheres of English experience. There its realization has, first, created a splendid national life, ruled by a free loyalty, which is incomprehensible to

the iron systems of despotism, and lasting on in an unbroken continuity, while revolution has convulsed them, or oppression has brought with it decay of national strength. It has, next, been the chief secret of that extraordinary spread of the dominion and influence of the English-speaking race, which is acknowledged as being in some sense unique in the history of the world. Accordingly it has been, as indeed it was bound to be, the leading characteristic of the English Christianity, which lies at the heart of English character and English influence. Even under the Papal autocracy it asserted itself vigorously, although perhaps illogically so long as that autocracy was acknowledged, mainly in respect of the independence of the National Church, but in some degree in respect of individual freedom of thought and faith. In the sixteenth century that assertion in both its elements, but especially the latter, was made more thorough and consistent. On it depends the true meaning of the common phrase, sometimes discredited, but undoubtedly true, that the Church of England is at once "Catholic and Protestant." For Protestantism, if we pass beyond its merely negative sense of repudiation of Papal authority and doctrines distinctively Romish, is really religious individuality; while Catholicity involves the right subordination of this individuality to the authority of the whole body. But this harmony of the two ideas was a natural growth, not an artificial balance of opposites. There can be no greater error than to suppose, as men constantly appear to suppose, that the course of the English Reformation in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, or of the subsequent history of the English Church, was determined by a deliberate attempt to secure this

harmony artificially, and to choose with that view what has been called (from an extension of a statement in the Preface to our Prayer-Book, which refers only to the matter of Revision), the *Via Media* of balance between opposite extremes. The leading idea of our Reformers was undoubtedly the ascertainment and revival in all essentials of primitive truth, as is shown by the emphatic appeal to the sufficiency and supremacy of Holy Scripture, as the *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiæ*. A true way is likely enough to be a middle way; for historically errors are apt to diverge on either hand. But it is important to understand that the ideal of the Church of England is the *Via Media quia vera*, and not the *Via vera quia Media:* for there is a world-wide difference between the comprehensiveness which is the natural result of the one, and the compromise which must attach to the other. Nor should we fail to notice that, as usual in our English experience, the approach to that ideal has been rather a natural and gradual advance, than the result of any deliberate scheme of thought and action. For the object contemplated has always been the modification and reformation of the old, so far, and only so far, as was necessary, rather than the striking out of a system absolutely new. In this respect the Christianity of the Church of England stood out in the sixteenth century in obvious distinction from Continental Protestantism, especially in the logical completeness of the Calvinistic system, by which the Puritan party tried in vain to mould it. In this it still stands distinct from the Christianity of other reformed Communions at home and abroad. The distinction involved, and still involves, some penalty of isolation. But it points to that in

which lie the real strength of the Church of England, and her hope of larger service to Christendom.

In all that is here said I shall take it for granted that this ideal will be substantially preserved. It is, indeed, natural, perhaps inevitable, that there should have been at different times tendencies within the Church of England itself to destroy or impair this characteristic position, by so exaggerating one or other of the elements of this harmony, as practically to ignore the harmony itself. In past times this tendency has been perhaps mainly what is commonly called "ultra-Protestant," recognising only the sacredness of individual Christianity, ignoring the equal sacredness of the collective life of the Church itself, and ascribing whatever authority and unity it has to its Establishment by the State. At the present moment what calls itself the "Catholic Revival" adopts the opposite extreme, tending to overbear individual freedom and independence, as far as possible, by appeal to ecclesiastical, which is virtually clerical authority, and accordingly, as it seems, desiring to revert, in respect both of worship and Church government, to that condition of things which the Reformation swept away. These tendencies manifest themselves in the formation of opposite schools of thought in the Church, to which they give a distinctive colour, and which stand in pronounced and often vehement antagonism. But the seriousness of these divisions, unhappy as they are, is apt to be exaggerated, both within the Church, and still more beyond her pale. They do not touch the chief fundamentals of the faith; they do not enlist in their conflict the mass of the Church; their sound is far greater than their strength; what her enemies call "a city of confusion"

is really "a city that hath the foundations." For neither of these antagonistic tendencies has ever prevailed, or is likely to prevail, against the comprehensive ideal of the Church of England. There were times, as in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when success may have appeared to be within the reach of the former; but the appearance was falsified by the event. The latter, however, loudly and earnestly urged, is simply an anachronism; its prevalence is out of the question; it is more likely to provoke a dangerous and revolutionary reaction in the opposite direction. The great body of the Church goes on quietly in loyalty to its old traditions—perhaps over quietly; for it allows the extremes, vehemently and noisily self-assertive, to assume an apparent importance, far beyond their intrinsic strength.

II. Now this harmony of individuality and unity is not a matter of theory, nor does it depend on abstract declarations, which have little effect on the great mass of men. It is brought home practically to all in the doctrine of the Word and the Sacraments, and so in the daily life and worship of the Church.

The appeal to Holy Scripture, as the one ultimate standard of faith, is a leading characteristic of all English Christianity. But it is put forth with a singular clearness and force in the Church of England. Probably no Church in Christendom has enunciated it more decisively; few, if any, have taken so much pains to make it effective, by providing that Holy Scripture shall be read through and through in the public Service. Of course, to take the Bible literally, as "the Bible alone," without illustration and interpretation from the thought and life of the Church in all ages, and

to suppose that no ordinance of the Church can have authority, which is not expressly enjoined in Holy Scripture, is not to take the Bible as God gave it. For it was certainly given under His Providence to a Church, and given in close connection with its continuous life. The Old Testament grew up through the centuries within the Covenant of Israel; it cannot be fully understood except in connection with the history of the covenanted people. The New Testament grew up through the first century of our era, in a Church, which had actually been founded in the whole Roman Empire before the New Testament itself was complete; and it takes the existence and authority of that Church for granted in every page. The Church of England, true, as usual, to history, commits no such error; she accepts the Creeds of the Catholic Church, as the interpreters of Scriptural truth, in its essence and in the right proportion of its various elements; she recognises that the Church, and even "each particular or national Church," "has an authority to decree rites and ceremonies," which is binding on the individual conscience, provided that nothing be decreed contrary to Holy Scripture; "as a witness and keeper of Holy Writ," she claims "authority"—a real, although not absolute or infallible, authority—"in controversies of faith." But that authority is of interpretation, not of addition; no tradition of the Church is to be co-ordinated with Scripture, and regarded *pari pietatis affectu et reverentia*. Nothing is allowed to set aside, or explain away, the free appeal to Holy Scripture as supreme; nothing accordingly to stand between it and the individual mind and conscience of the believer.

Now this appeal to an open Bible, freely circulated

and freely read, is certainly the charter of individuality in the Church. For the Bible speaks directly to the individual, as the Word of God in Christ. It is, indeed, ministered to us by the Church, and, in fact, received by us generally through that ministration. But it can speak, and does speak, independently, as "living and powerful," to each soul alone, face to face with God, with no mediation except the mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ; and by it ultimately, as the supreme standard of faith, all teaching must be judged and tested in each man's conscience. The appeal to it is, therefore, the safeguard in the Church of individual freedom and individual responsibility.

Yet at the same time it clearly supplies the basis of the only Christian unity, which is possible in days of growing spiritual activity and spiritual freedom—a unity comprehensive of variety, because dependent on principle, rather than formal rule and law. That unity can be seen largely realized even now in our English Christianity, in spite of the divisions and controversies which are its bane. Wherever Holy Scripture is accepted as a Divine rule of faith, there is a striking agreement in the great body of English Christians on the fundamental verities of the faith, as expressed, for example, in the Apostles' Creed. For Holy Scripture, as we see more clearly every day, is a power, "not of the letter, but of the Spirit," in its infinite variety appealing to the whole man in mind and heart and spirit, and yet through all that variety essentially one. As simply a record, historical and spiritual, of the dispensation of God to humanity, it centres in the Word and Person of the Lord Jesus Christ. Up to Him all leads which goes before, from Him all which follows

is derived. Hence it has to be taken as a whole, which cannot be understood piecemeal, as though in each text or book the perfect truth was enshrined. So taken it founds our faith on the central reality—"learning Christ, and being taught of Christ"—and on this basis there must be a resting-place for all who come to Him as "having the words of eternal life."

The Church of England, moreover, as we know, has laid down as authoritative no theory as to the inspiration of that Holy Scripture. That it is a true and all-sufficient revelation of God in Christ, "containing all things necessary to salvation"—this, indeed, is most unequivocally asserted; but beyond this, which alone is absolutely needful, the declaration does not go. It implies, no doubt, a belief in a special and unique inspiration of the writers of Holy Scripture, enabling them to speak in the name of God the Gospel of Christ, in words of truth, which shall endure for ever, and determine the faith of all mankind. But what that inspiration is, how it has been given, how much it implies, how it is related to the human personality of him who receives it and to the spirit of his age—this is nowhere determined. On all these points the thoughtful mind must and will speculate; on all these has always been, among sincere believers, great variety of opinion. But on the determination of them the Church does not venture: for it is clearly a secret of the Spirit of God Himself.

Accordingly, in the study of Holy Scripture, our English Christianity leaves free scope for the Biblical criticism, which examines these very points; and gives her members perfect liberty to consider it in each case on its own merits, provided always—and the proviso

is important—that the great fundamental principle, so emphatically asserted, shall neither be denied nor explained away. In this generation it is all but universally acknowledged that, taken as a whole, such criticism has given a more living interest and force to Holy Scripture, and taught us better to understand it in all the stages of its development as a whole. No doubt the criticism itself, especially the confident *a priori* criticism, needs to be criticized, and corrected by appeal to evidences of a different kind ; and experience, in regard especially to the New Testament, has shown us how, so treated, it is sure to be reduced to its right limits of authority. But it is to such correction, not to suppression or denunciation, that the Church of England is bound by her traditions to trust.

Nor is her position different in relation to the discoveries of physical or historical science, which crowd upon us every day. All who believe in God must suppose that the book of Nature and the book of Humanity are in a true sense books of God, revealing Him in His almighty power, His perfect wisdom, His transcendent righteousness and love. If, therefore, the Church of England appeals to Holy Scripture as the supreme revelation of Him, she is bound to welcome all these lower revelations as necessarily harmonizing with it, although incapable of rising to the higher mysteries of the Gospel, which this supreme revelation has made to be the treasure of all humanity. Their discoveries may affect, and have affected, our interpretations of Holy Scripture, where it touches upon the lower spheres. But the central spiritual truth, and its inherent spiritual power, they cannot touch. Nay, as they are more philosophically considered, and pre-

tensions put forth in their name are more carefully scrutinized, there can be no doubt that, like the Biblical criticism to which I have already referred, they have already thrown the light of illustration and analogy on many of the most important elements of the Christian faith. And this attitude of what may be called a friendly and gracious independence towards all scientific or historical discovery is of infinite importance ; on it depends not only the freedom of individual thought and faith within the pale of the Church, but also the accordance of her teaching with human progress, and the consequent prospect of her ability to direct and mould it in the future, as in the past.

Once more—and this vitally affects its fitness for the vast opportunity of missionary work, which has been given us under the Providence of God—our English Christianity is now learning to assume a corresponding attitude towards the religions of the world. We see the infinite significance of the fact, that in all races of the earth religion in some form—the recognition, that is, of a Superhuman Power creating, ruling, sustaining the world and man—is in possession of the whole field of human thought. Crude, often grotesque, in the barbarian races—elaborate, profound, philosophical in advanced civilisations—everywhere it manifests itself as a development of an universal instinct implanted in our human nature by its Creator. As such, it must always have an essential sacredness, in spite of all perversions, hesitations, superstitions. Our English Christianity is more and more realizing that sacredness, and beginning to reproduce, with the advantage of larger knowledge and experience, the attitude of the old Alexandrian School of Theology towards the heathenism of earlier

days. For, after all, this is but to follow the teaching of St. Paul at Athens. It is to acknowledge, on the one hand, that all these religions are embodiments of that "feeling after God," which is an element of the supreme purpose, for which "He made of one blood all the nations of the earth," and that whatever is true in them is a divine revelation, through which they "find Him," or rather "are found of Him." It is to put forth, on the other, with reverent and enthusiastic confidence, the claim of our Christianity to declare in Christ the God who, to their "ignorant worship," is "a God unknown," though not unfelt, and in this revelation, of which they are but "broken lights," to dispel all mists of doubt, and all clouds of error and superstition. The deeper study of the religions of the world, in the light of our Christianity, and especially the comparison of their sacred books with the transcendent power of Holy Scripture, have certainly taught us to hold firmly both these elements of the Apostolic teaching, and to hold them moreover in their right proportion.

All these things are results of the supreme appeal to Holy Scripture, bringing out, first the freedom of religious individuality, and then through it the unity of comprehensiveness.

The same result seems to follow, but in the reverse order, from the co-ordination of the Sacraments of the Gospel with the Word.

Primarily it is clear that the Sacraments are witnesses and expressions of Church unity. For they cannot be laid hold of by each man for himself; they need the ministration of the Church. By the first, men "are grafted into the body of Christ's Church;" by the second, they are perfected in the membership thus

begun. As Hooker expresses it in well-known words: "The saving grace, which Christ originally is, or hath, for the good of His whole Church, the same by sacraments He severally deriveth to each member thereof." The Church of England has brought out in her Services, with unmistakable emphasis, the mysterious reality of the Sacraments, as Christ ordained them in His Church for ever. In relation to that second great Sacrament, which has unhappily been the battlefield of religious coutroversy, she has in her Service gone back through the ancient Liturgies to what we may well hold to be the substance of an Apostolic original. This "sacramental teaching" is the needful and most unequivocal witness to the corporate life and unity in Christ of the Church as a whole. By pure religious individualism it is accordingly apt to be ignored or depreciated. In an age like our own—when pure individualism in any form is felt to be insufficient to solve human problems, and when what may be called in the most general sense "socializing" principles are increasingly maintained and reverenced—it is most natural that this sacramental teaching of our Prayer-Book, and the consciousness which it implies of the sacredness of the Communion of Saints, and its authority over individual life, should have been brought out, in word and in practice, with increased emphasis, and should, as usual, have sometimes tended by reaction to exaggeration. This movement of thought (be it noted) is traceable in different degrees in other religious Communions than our own. But in the steadfast and thoughtful maintenance of it by our own Church, is one main secret of her power of adaptation to the needs of humanity, especially in these later days.

At the same time it will be noticed that in her sacramental teaching, individuality is doubly guarded.

First, the Church has deliberately abstained from all attempts to dogmatize on the method and character of the mystery of the Sacraments, and has absolutely protested against rationalizing it (so to speak) in either direction, Roman or Zwinglian. On this matter individual opinion and faith are left free, with room for large variety of development. What was said by the same theologian, already quoted, as to the second great Sacrament, in an age of bold speculation and vehement controversy, expresses most truly the mind of the Church of England on the whole subject. There are sufficient grounds of universal agreement, on which all may rest. Beyond this lie varieties of theory, more or less speculative, more or less inclined to define the indefinable. It is well for her children to be of the number, not "of those who, because they enjoyed not, disputed, but of those who disputed not, because they enjoyed." All that is asked of them is to acknowledge the reality of the Sacraments as in the New Testament sense a "mystery," a secret (that is) of God's dispensation, revealed, so far as it can be revealed, by our Lord Jesus Christ.

Next, while emphatically witnessing to the reality of the Sacraments in themselves, the Church has, with at least equal emphasis, declared again and again that it can be made effectively real to each soul only through individual faith, drawing out, as in the Gospel miracle, the "virtue," which is in the Presence of Christ—in infancy a potential faith of promise, to be unfolded hereafter, in mature age a faith of actual energy. That which is spiritual can only be spiritually received. In

the clear conception of this truth is obviously the safeguard against superstition properly so-called; but in it is also implied the assertion of individuality, as resting all access to God on the secret grace of the Holy Spirit. When in 1559 the words of Administration in the Holy Communion were brought to their present form, dwelling in benediction on the reality of the Sacramental gift, and in exhortation on the conditionality of reception, the harmony of the two ideas was expressed with a clearness which leaves nothing to be desired.

III. It should be added that on this same harmony depends what is again of infinite importance, the true conception of the relation of the clergy and laity in the Church.

The Ministry of the Church is the chief organ of expression of its corporate life. It exists (as its very name implies) for the ministration both of the Word and of the Sacraments to the whole body of the Church. That it has so existed from the beginning, as an integral element in the constitution of the Church, and that those who are set apart for it have always been regarded, not as mere delegates of the congregation, but as having a mission from Christ Himself, through the chief of His existing ministers from the Apostles downwards—this is a matter of unquestionable historical fact. On that historical fact, not only as to the ministry in general, but even as to the three Orders of the ministry, the Church of England takes an unhesitating stand. Her Ordination service would be unmeaning, and worse than unmeaning, except on this ground; and it draws the inevitable inference, that continuity of ministerial charge implies a continuity of ministerial blessing from Christ Himself—an inference boldly expressed in the repetition

of the words of our Lord's own charge to His Apostles. It is well: for without this acknowledgment of the sacredness of the ministry, no Church can well have an authoritative and effective pastoral ministration, a firm organisation, and a real sense of corporate unity. No society can hold together without the recognition of some authority, having in some sense a Divine sanction, although not claiming, in virtue of that sanction, an absolute and irresponsible power. Such an authority the Church finds in a ministry, not dependent on the will of the congregation, but holding a commission from the Lord Himself. In keeping firmly to the acknowledgment of this character in the ministry, the Church of England places herself in indissoluble connection with the Church Catholic of the past and of the present.

On the other hand, the grasp of the principle of Individuality is the safeguard of the rights of the lay members of the Church; for it implies for every member of Christ individually a large measure of religious liberty, both in thought and in action; it asserts for him what has been called "the priesthood of the laity,"—the freedom (that is) of access to God in Christ, without absolute necessity of any intervention by the ministration of the Church; it claims for him an indefeasible right to all Church ordinances, provided that he has the necessary spiritual conditions of repentance and faith. In all these points the position of the Church of England stands in marked contrast with the strongly compacted system of priestly authority in the Church of Rome, as it once ruled, although with some restriction, in England, and as it now asserts itself more absolutely than ever in Churches under the Roman obedience. This freedom is so

deeply engrained in our whole conception of Christian life, that any attempt to destroy or even impair it must prove, as I have said, to be a pure anachronism, and accordingly a disastrous failure. For it should be noted that in the extreme simplicity of the terms of entrance on lay-membership—the acceptance of Holy Baptism and of the Apostles' Creed, which grew up freely in the West out of the simple Baptismal profession; in the large liberty of the actual membership, and in the free access, with due spiritual preparation, to the fulness of that membership in the Holy Communion, we find the expression of that comprehensiveness of the Church of England on a broad Scriptural basis, of which I have already spoken. It is a comprehensiveness which is often made her reproach, and which, undoubtedly, involves some loss of wholesome discipline, some risk of licence, division, perplexity, but which is nevertheless the secret of her vitality, and of the unequalled influence which she exercises over English life and thought. Liberty may be perverted to licence through abeyance of discipline; but it is still the true condition of humanity and the mainspring of its progress. Nor is this all. For with individual liberty, as experience in other relations of life shows us, is always associated some claim of a share in the collective self-government of the Church itself, in respect of the legislative, judicial, and executive functions which such self-government implies; and this claim must be made practically effective through the representative institutions, which alone are capable of reconciling freedom with unity. All these rights of the laity belong to the traditions of our Church; all were distinctly reasserted in the whole action of the Reformation. The individual rights are

recognised still to the full. The right to a co-ordination in government of laity with clergy is acknowledged, as a matter of course, in all other branches of the Anglican Communion. If it has fallen into abeyance in England itself—in consequence not so much of Establishment as of the abuses of Establishment—no one can doubt that we are feeling our way towards it in our tentative English fashion ; that in some way the self-government of the whole body must be attained; and that, when it is attained, the two Orders can work in it together, without confusion and conflict, because without trenching on each other's rights.

Such, as it seems to me, is the leading characteristic principle of English Christianity as represented in the National Church, which is, I believe, in reality, as well as in theory, the truest organ of expression of the Christianity of the nation as a whole. But in working out this principle, which is (as I have said) characteristically English in the civil as well as in the ecclesiastical sphere, against the irregularities and inconsistencies of which Englishmen are tolerant even to excess, there can be no doubt that our Church suffers greatly from the want of that which is the very life of the nation—the power through self-government of self-reformation and self-adaptation, throwing off what is virtually obsolete, adopting what is required by new needs and opportunities. The result of this want is a mixture of constitutional immobility with developments of a strong individual licence. Constitutionally we can change little or nothing. In times of crisis and difficulty we are obliged to rally round a Prayer-Book, even in its present form more than two hundred years old ; our clergy still sign Articles intended for the needs, and tinctured

by the theology, of the sixteenth century. Church reform and Church discipline can seldom be carried out without the consent of a Parliament wholly different in character from the Parliament of the Reformation period, and in many cases cannot be carried out at all. The lay members of the Church as such have no constitutional means of expressing their opinion on Church policy or doctrine. Practically there is, almost of necessity, much of arbitrary irregularity, individual and congregational; much of irresponsible agitation and dictation through voluntary societies and Church newspapers; much unwillingness to submit to constitutional authority, and a practical impossibility of appeal in the last resort to Church law through our existing Courts. For variation from appointed order there is but one means of authorization in that Episcopal licence, which in itself might be questioned in strict law: in default of legal enforcement, appeal can only be made to Episcopal decisions, which have to rely simply on moral authority, and have no remedy against wilful disobedience. That, in spite of all these drawbacks, the Church is advancing, and that rapidly, in power and efficiency, is happily true. But it is also true that the present position is fraught with difficulty and danger; and the only remedy seems to lie in the attainment or restoration of self-government of the whole body. That this is not inconsistent with Establishment in fact, the experience of the Church of Scotland shows. Nay, we may see clearly that, if exercised, as it must be exercised, under recognition of the power of Parliament to prevent its infringing on the rights of individual citizens, or militating against the welfare of the whole community, it must tend to the efficiency of

the Church in that service to the higher life of the people, which is the object of Establishment, and be accordingly for the interests of the nation as well as of the Church. Certainly it seems to be the one thing most needful for the full vitality and progress of English Christianity, as represented in the National Church.

IV. It presses itself with a special urgency on our attention at this moment, because in the Church of England the present century has been, as I have already said, a most remarkable era of expansion. This expansion is the fruit of the revivals which have passed over it, and thrilled through its whole life during the last hundred years; and these—realizing vividly, as all true revivals must do, the Headship of Christ—seem to have corresponded generally to the evolution of the idea of that Headship, which we trace in the New Testament. The strong Evangelical revival of personal Christianity early in the century drew its inspiration from the truth on which St. Paul dwelt to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xi. 3), that "Christ is the Head of every man" in his own distinct individuality. The great High-Church movement which followed—avowedly not to supersede, but to supplement it—was simply a realization, in view of the continuity of truth and life in the Church as a whole, of the later utterance of the same Apostle to the Ephesians (Eph. i. 22), that "Christ is the Head over all things to the Church, which is His body." The broader and larger conception of our Christianity, which is now developing itself—not least among the adherents of the High-Church movement—rather seems to take up the teaching of the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians on the

"gathering up under one head" all humanity and all created being in Christ (Eph. i. 10; Col. i. 16–18), claiming for Him all knowledge and life, and seeing in His Gospel the interpretation of both. The result has been to bring out, as in the ancient Creeds, the transcendent significance of the Incarnation; as, on the one hand, implying the completion of its purpose for the salvation of the world from the guilt and bondage of sin, through the Atonement, the Resurrection, the Ascension; as, on the other hand, throwing back its light on the pre-existence of the Son of God, and so on the true nature of the Godhead, and showing itself, as in the Divine counsels "ordained from the foundation of the world"—to be the consummation of the creation of humanity in that image of God, which is defaced but not destroyed by the sin of the present, and is to be restored perfectly in the future. It preaches "Christ crucified," deeply conscious of the burden of sin, with its fruits of suffering and death, under which we can see that all humanity groans, and hailing in Him the Saviour, who is the propitiation for our sins. But it preaches also Christ the Eternal "Word of God," incarnate in our humanity, to regenerate it in Himself, and to give us the capacity of the new life here and hereafter. It is clear that the vivid consciousness of this supreme truth must determine the conception of the mission of the Church to humanity, and of humanity itself.

These three movements of revival, showing themselves at first in the formation of schools and parties in the Church, and resulting accordingly in much controversy and conflict, because each was apt to assume itself to be all in all, are now undoubtedly being fused

together, stirring the life of the whole body, and giving it much enlargement of idea and operation, and a wider conception of its own mission to the world. For just in proportion as, under different aspects, they realize the One Headship, men come to see that it is greater than their own conception of it, and to discern the truth contained in the views taken of it by others. Exaggeration and extravagance there are still, and always will be, in those who are incapable of this discernment. But, in great degree, it is impressing itself on the great body of the Church, and in this lies much of the hope of the future.

This expansion of idea is closely connected, both in cause and effect, with that extraordinary outward expansion of the Church (corresponding to the general "Expansion of England"), which has been the glory of this century, and especially of the last fifty or sixty years. Few things are more remarkable in Church history than the development of the Church of England—once described, somewhat scornfully, by Macaulay as an institution "as purely local" to England, "as the Court of Common Pleas"—once supposed by many to derive its unity and authority simply from that recognition and support of it by the State, which we call "Establishment,' and to which, of course, this purely local character does attach—into a great "Anglican Communion," having a world-wide extension and an independent life. That development, moreover, although solid enough, has been marvellously rapid. It belongs almost entirely to our own age; for it is little more than a hundred years since the first creation of an English Episcopate abroad, marking the first planting of an independent and self-governed Branch of our

Church, beyond the narrow limits of our own shores. Even when this beginning had been made, the progress was for many years slow. At the opening of the present reign there were but seven of such bishoprics in the whole area of the British Empire, where now there are more than eighty, to say nothing of nearly the same number in the Sister Church in America. Now we see everywhere vigorous and self-governing branches of the Church, still preserving a close unity with the Mother Church at home. And this expansion brings with it a great variety of development. The Sister Church in the United States, and the Churches of the three great groups of our Colonies, in North America and the West Indies, in Australasia, and in South Africa, are, as might have been expected, virtual reproductions in the English-speaking race, with independent variations and adaptations to various needs, of the old Church of England itself, only without the national recognition of Establishment, and with a more unfettered freedom. But the growth of our Church has extended itself far beyond our own race, partly by direct missionary impulse from England, partly by corresponding missionary energy in the sister or daughter Churches. In face alike of the ancient religions and civilisations of Asia, and of the comparative barbarism of Africa or Polynesia, new daughter Churches are springing up, which we rightly call "native Churches," because, while they have been planted and watered by our English hands, they must gradually have a large independence of development, on lines of their own, and by their own ministry. United with us in the essentials of Christian truth and Catholic order, they are not by any means to reproduce the formal Anglican constitution, which is

here a natural growth, but which would be artificial and unreal for races and conditions of life wholly unlike our own. The task of this varied and almost unbounded expansion has been a glorious, but a formidable task. We cannot say that it has been adequately carried out, or that the Church of England has fully maintained, even in the "Greater Britain," the spiritual leadership, which ought to be hers in English Christianity. But still the expansion has been great already; and the undoubted awakening of a stronger missionary spirit gives promise of a more rapid progress in the next fifty years. The growth of the Lambeth Conference, which is really, though not formally, a General Anglican Council, is a visible token of that expansion. Fifty years ago it would have been thought impossible. Even at its first conception, it was received with hesitation and division of opinion. Now it has established itself as an indispensable part of our collective Church life—a manifestation to ourselves and to all men of emergence from insularity to a world-wide extension—an object lesson on the combination of spiritual unity with freedom and variety.

V. For, as has been seen, this visible expansion "in length and breadth" is, as usual, closely connected with expansion "in depth and height." It bids the Church go down deep to the ultimate foundation in Christ; it bids it rise to higher conceptions and hopes of its own mission for Him.

Accordingly it has, on the one hand, forced upon us the all-important distinction between fundamentals, on which all must be at one, and the secondary development of idea and practice, in which variety according to various needs is a condition of vitality. Unity cannot any

longer be identified, as perhaps in our Church it was too apt to be identified, with uniformity. The claim of freedom of variation within the necessary limits, put forward by our Church for herself in the sixteenth century, is seen to have a wide application. In estimating, moreover, the essentials of faith and the condition of communion, the tendency of our time is undoubtedly towards simplicity —not the simplicity of vagueness and superficiality, but the simplicity of the deepest and most definite thought. If a Church is to include all nations and characters, uniting dominant and subject races in one brotherhood, reviving old civilisations and civilizing barbarism, it is obvious that it must rest simply on the one foundation of "Christ as all in all."

On the other hand, this expansion has necessarily inspired higher and larger conceptions of what is the mission of English Christianity to the world. It is not to be content with isolation for itself, still less to glory in it as a mark of purity and superiority. A world-wide extension must carry with it an universal mission. Nor is it to acquiesce, contentedly or despondently, in the present divisions which splinter up Christianity generally, and are among the chief hindrances to that extension of the Church of Christ over the whole world, of which the title "Catholic" is a claim and a promise. Serious thinkers, even beyond her pale, have ascribed to the Church of England the capacity, and therefore the duty, of a "ministry of reconciliation." Certainly nothing is more remarkable in the recent proceedings of the Lambeth Conferences than the earnest desire to realize that idea—not only in regard to these divisions in our English Christianity itself, which are its shame and hindrance, but in rela-

tion to the divided Churches of Christendom. On every side there is a reaching out towards reunion. In one direction only is it barred, because in that direction a wholly different ideal of Church unity is inflexibly presented, and submission to it imperiously demanded. The Roman ideal is a despotic spiritual empire over all Christendom, driven by the very nature of its pretensions to claim for its head a superhuman authority and infallibility. The ideal of the Anglican Communion is a free federation of Churches, under the sole headship of Christ Himself, each having its own characteristics and variety of development, but all having communion with one another in Him. The two are so absolutely incompatible, that union between those who hold to them is practically impossible. But no one who reads the history of the past, or studies the nature and progress of humanity, will doubt with which of these two ideals lies the greater hope of the future.

The basis of such federation, even more truly than the basis of Anglicanism, must be a basis simple and deep. For the reunion of English Christianity itself, the Lambert Conference laid down as a basis of faith, only the acknowledgment of Holy Scripture as the ultimate standard of truth ; the acceptance of the two Creeds, substantially Œcumenical Creeds, of the West and the East; the preservation of the two great Sacraments as ordained by Christ Himself; and as a basis of Government, "the historic Episcopate"—that is, the Episcopate as a great, all but universal, fact, without insistence on any theory of its origin and its authority—taking for granted, moreover, that constitution of Synodical Government, which limits Episcopal autocracy, and

unites all, clergy and laity alike, in the legislation of the Church. Of these the first three are simply the embodiment of the essence of Christianity as such. On the last, although it stands on a wholly different footing, yet certainly, if we consider Christendom as a whole, depends the only chance of anything like visible unity between the Churches of the world at large. After all, the non-Episcopal Christianity of the world is but a fragment, although a considerable and important fragment; and for it the conditions of federation might be simpler than even the conditions of reunion. How far this ideal of our Anglican Christianity is from any hope of realization is only too obvious. But to have it before us, if it be indeed a true ideal, must exercise an infinitely important influence, not only on the Church policy of the future, but on the tone and character of our Church in the present.

VI. To the progress of English Christianity, in itself and in its service to the whole Church of Christ along the lines here indicated, there are two main hindrances. Looking to English Christianity as a whole, there is the disintegration and confusion caused by our religious divisions—felt only too keenly at home, but felt even more painfully in the fields of its expansion. For divisions, in spite of the sincerest professions, are but too apt to become antagonisms: they not only fritter away our spiritual strength, but waste it by friction. Moreover, they must tend to impair the true proportion of the faith. Each sect comes into existence in order to emphasize some one element of Christian doctrine or order. It can hardly fail to make this emphasis disproportionate; for unhappily under these conditions the lesser points of our differences are allowed to obscure

the greater points of our universal agreement. No doubt there is often, perhaps generally, some happy forgetfulness of these divisions in face of the conflict against heathenism and sin. But it is not absolute and universal. The witness of our English Christianity is therefore confused and discredited, both to the Church and to the world. If only these divisions could be, wholly or partially, removed—even if the bitterness of conflict and estrangement could be mitigated—no one can doubt that the effectiveness of that witness would be multiplied tenfold. What human probability there is of this, who can tell? But at least it is right that the Church of England, from which the secessions of these divided bodies have taken place,—on grounds, moreover, which in many cases have been almost entirely removed—should earnestly strive against such division in prayer, and reiterate invitation to consider and promote some measure of reunion.

Looking to the Church of England itself, we find unfortunately some reproduction within her own pale of these religious divisions—always undermining her unity and effectiveness of power—from time to time breaking out into virulence of conflict, and threatening actual disruption. But over and above these, and perhaps not unconnected with them, there is a still greater hindrance, in her undoubted difficulty of origination, or even adaptation, to meet new needs, and rise to new opportunities, due mainly to that loss of self-government, to which I have already referred. Perhaps in any case a certain over-conservatism, afraid of bold ventures, distrustful of new enthusiasms, averse to great schemes of advance, might be among her characteristics. But the present conditions almost force that over-

conservatism upon the Church: for the want of constitutional means of right innovation makes it the best safeguard against vagary and error, against internal division and conflict. Conservative of the great simple essentials of faith and order, she has always been, and I trust always will be. But if she is to fulfil her obvious mission of expansion, and her possible ministry of reconciliation, at home and abroad, she must unite with this conservatism of the old some greater elasticity in her methods of thought and action, with a view to the new developments to which she is and will be called. Had this been hers in the past, she might have been spared some of the secessions, which have withdrawn from her so much of the vital Christianity of England. Till it is made possible to her now, it is certain that her advance must be greatly hampered, and her witness for her characteristic principles must lose the freshness of right adaptation to the present.

Still, in spite of these hindrances, it is hard to doubt that there is a great future for English Christianity in general, and especially for it as represented in the Church of England. The advance towards it will, no doubt, bring out prominently the characteristics of that general advance of English power and influence, of which it is a chief determining and inspiring element. Its expansion will have in it much of that natural and half-unconscious growth which Sir John Seeley has traced in the general "Expansion of England." It will probably be tentative, partial, gradual, sometimes almost involuntary: determined at each moment by the force of practical needs and opportunities, rather than by great preconceived schemes of policy; bolder, therefore, in action than in origination, and liable to

friction, irregularity, vicissitude; always more careful to recognise truths and principles which appear to be genuine, than to weld them together into logical consistency; inclined accordingly, almost to excess, to leave opinions to develop themselves freely, and to trust, in case of conflict, to natural (or supernatural) selection for "the survival of the fittest." But, if it be faithful to that harmony of individuality and unity, which gives it vitality and comprehensiveness, the advance will be real and probably continuous. For it will be in accordance with what must be the spirit of the Christianity of the future—simple in its basis, various in its superstructure, inclusive of all who hold firmly to the Divine Headship of the Lord Jesus Christ, as the secret alike of individual and collective life, and the supreme reality in the relation of the finite to the Infinite.

Printed by BALLANTYNE, HANSON & Co.
Edinburgh & London

BW898 .G99
The Church past and present : a review
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00063 3794